This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

GRAD
BX
5087
.V5811
1717
BUHR

A 952,638

THE UNIVERSITY OF
LIBRARIES

The Church and State Vindicated;

AND THE

Biſhop of *Bangor's*

PRESERVATIVE

DEFENDED,

Againſt Several late ANSWERS to it.

In a LETTER to the Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of ELY.

Ιερωσύνη καὶ βασιλεία εἰς ἓν ὁρῶσι τέλος, τὴν τῶν ὑπηκόων σωτηρίαν. Iſidor. Peluſiot.

By the Author of The Divine Rights of the *Britiſh* Nation.

LONDON,

Printed by J. DARBY for R. BURLEIGH in *Amen-Corner*, J. HARRISON at the *Royal Exchange*, and A. DODD without *Temple-Bar*. M. DCC. XVII.

(Price One Shilling.)

BX
5087
.V581
1717
BUHR

723.160-129

The Bishop of BANGOR's Preservative *Defended*, &c.

MY LORD,

§. 1. HEN some of the *Bishops*, and a small number of our *Clergy*, refus'd the Oaths that were appointed *Anno* 1689, I have very good Reason to believe, not one of 'em had it in his Thoughts, at first, to form a *Separation* from *our Church*. The *Questions* upon which there was a Disagreement at that time, were chiefly of a *Civil Nature*; about which there began to be different Opinions in the Reign of King *James* the First; yet these were not judg'd to be of that consequence to the Church, as to make it necessary for a Convocation to declare its Judgment thereupon.

§. 2. I take it for granted (because I am sure the contrary does not appear from any Authentick Act or Decision made or done in any Convocation held from the beginning of the *Reformation*) that our *Church* has never yet in her *Supreme Judicature*, after

a ſpecial Deliberation, given us her final and explicite Declaration of her Senſe upon all the Queſtions that were firſt debated between Us and the *Nonjurors*, in favour of the ſaid *Nonjurors*, and againſt us, who maintain the Juſtice of the preſent Settlement. But on the contrary, this we are ſure of, from Archbiſhop *Sancroft*'s Copy of *Canons*, publiſh'd 1689, that the Senſe of the *Convocation*, which made thoſe *Canons* about 1606, was entirely on our ſide, and fully againſt the *Nonjurors* in ſeveral Particulars.

§. 3. 'Tis very well known, my Lord, that our Biſhops in Parliament have frequently concurr'd with the State in many ſuch Votes and publick Acts, as plainly ſhew'd their Sentiments were different from the Opinions of thoſe Gentlemen who have of late Years refus'd the Oaths: Of this their Men o Reading cannot be ignorant. And certainly it ought to be well conſider'd by 'em, that though there as been no Judicial Determination in form by our whole Church-Repreſentative, upon the ſeveral Queſtions in diſpute between Us and the Nonjurors; yet our Biſhops, and our ableſt Writers, have oftendeclar'd their Senſe before the *Revolution* happen: and which is more than that, before the unhapy Troubles in the Reign of King *Charles* the Firſt, at which time they could be under no Biaſs or Impreſſions from their own or the publick Circumſtans; and by conſequence, their Judgments muſt have been the more impartial. Men of Probity and Meſty can never perſuade themſelves, that what was done and agreed, nay and zealouſly eſpous'd by our Biſhops in Parliament in the Caſe of the Queen of *Bs*, and of the Aſſiſtance of her Subjects and the *Dut*, againſt their oppreſſive Princes; can poſſibly be oppos'd to favour the modern Opinions of our *Nonors*. Nor do the Nonjurors pretend to approve the Aſſiſtance that was given, or pretended to be given, to the *Rochellers* by King *Charles* the Firſt; no like the Forms of Prayer then us'd in our Chhes in behalf

half of our *Proteſtant Brethren* in *France*. No, theſe Authorities are fully on our ſide, and as fully againſt the *Nonjurors*; of which they are ſufficiently ſenſible, and make us ſo too, by the weak and evaſive Defences they have publiſh'd againſt them.

§. 4. As our Convocations, which are our ſupreme *Eccleſiaſtical Aſſemblys*, have not actually decided our ſeveral controverted Queſtions about *Civil Power and Obedience*; ſo 'tis not very probable they will do it: becauſe, though Obedience in general to Superiors of all kinds, is a Chriſtian Doctrine; yet the particular Inſtances of Civil Power and Obedience are Matters purely of a Civil Nature and Cognizançe, and are only and finally determinable by our *Laws*, and in our *Legiſlative Aſſemblies*, in Parliament; and by no means in a *Convocation*, who act not there as Legiſlators, by a ſupreme and underiv'd Authority.

§. 5. However, my Lord, we have on our ſide the higheſt Eccleſiaſtical Authorities that are extant; I mean, that of our Biſhops acting in their Legiſlative Capacity: and we have alſo on our ſide the Supreme Civil Authority, in ſome Inſtances or other, in every Reign ſince the Reformation, as I ſhall fully evince upon ſome other Occaſion. But, which is above all theſe Authorities, we have alſo on our ſide the higheſt Authority, I mean the Word of God; and the general Senſe of all Civiliz'd Nations: To which our Adverſaries, the *Nonjurors*, oppoſe ſome ill-choſen Paſſages out of the *Homilies*, and the Writings of *Private Divines*; and they are ſo unreaſonable, as to ſtile ſuch defective Authorities the Doctrine of the *Church*, and demand we ſhould receive 'em as *ſuch*. And as to their Comments upon the Thirteenth of the *Romans*, and ſome other Texts in the Old and New Teſtament, they are ſo injudicious, not to ſay abſurd and ſtupid, that I have often bluſh'd to ſee ſome Men, who in other Matters are not deſtitute of Prudence and Underſtanding, openly eſpouſing and forming

forming a Party againſt Church and State, upon ſo weak a Foundation.

§. 6. The Leaders ſoon grew ſenſible, that their Cauſe would ſink, and their Faction expire, if they built their Hopes upon the Strength of their *Civil Notions*; and this put 'em upon looking out for *Succours*. Accordingly they began in their Pamphlets to attack the *Royal Supremacy*; they maintain'd ſoon after the *Independency of the Church on the State*; they advanc'd *new Notions of Sacerdotal Power*; *the Neceſſity of a regular and uninterrupted Succeſſion*; *the Invalidity of the Sacraments, and of all Divine Offices adminiſtred by our Proteſtant Brethren at home and abroad*; *the Efficacy of Sacerdotal Abſolution*; *the Uſefulneſs of Prayers for the Dead: and one of their number been ſo hardy as to defend the Natural Mortality of Human Souls.* But to compleat their Deſign, they ha' at laſt agreed upon a Scheme of Civil and Religious Notions, which ſtrike at the Root of our Reformation; inſomuch that they have publickly declar'd their Hopes of an Union with the Popiſh Church *France*, and at the ſame time aſſert our Church to be Schiſmatical, and our Prayers and Miniſtrations to be Wicked and Immoral.

§. 7. In this Diſpoſition are our Jacobite Separatiſts, though their Leaders, ABiſhop *Sancroft*, Biſhop *Kenn*, and Dr. *Hickes*, were all within a few hours taking the Oaths to King *William*. The two 'st perhaps, who died ſome years ſince, little thot 'st of the Schemes that Dr. *Hickes* and his Adherents form'd afterwards; and had they liv'd, 'tis reaſonable to think, would have diſapprov'd 'em. By the Death of the reſt, Dr. *Hickes* was left at the Head of the *Schiſm*, and being a Man of Spirit and Animoſity, reſolv'd to be conſiderable: with the Aſſiſtance of ſome Under-Writers, he has leven'd the Nation with ſome Principles inconſiſtent with our Conſtitution in *Church* and *State*; when at the ſame time thoſe Writers pretend an extraordinary Zeal for both,

and by that impoſe upon the Unwary. But ıow they have thrown off the Mask; they declare r Eſtabliſh'd Church Schiſmatical, and affirm the obite Party to be the only True Church of *Eng-land.*

§. 8. This Party, though inconſiderable in it ſelf for Numbers or Intereſt, yet are confident and tur-ıulent; chiefly becauſe they have receiv'd too much Countenance from ſome, who have taken the Oaths to the preſent Government; whom, in requital that Kindneſs, the Nonjurors look upon as A-ıtates.

9. 'Tis no wonder to ſee a Fluctuation in Mens Principles, when too many ſet out at firſt without ıy good Foundation; and ſo few give Attention e-nough to examine the Grounds of the Chriſtian Religion, and of our *Engliſh* Reformation and Conſtitution. Others are under an unhappy Biaſs from Reſentment or Diſappointment; and the Opinions of moſt are not owing to Meditation, but Party.

Warm with Prejudice and Party-Zeal, ſome have fallen upon the Biſhop of *Bangor*'s *Preſervative*; 'tis not ſtrange he ſhould offend the *Nonjurors*, for their Cauſe is deſperate: methinks therefore abler Pens ſhould have been employ'd. But 'tis ſurprizing to find two Perſons of our own Communion attack the Biſhop with ſo little Ceremony. Some years ſince a Man would for this have been call'd a thouſand *Presbyterians*; now the Tide is turn'd, to defend our Biſhops is a ſure Mark of a *Presbyterian:* if Men indulge this peeviſh Humour, they will gratify the Papiſts, and call our Liturgy and Homilies *Presbyterian* at laſt. The common Enemy boaſt in their Correſpondence abroad, of the Giddineſs of our People, and make uſe of the preſent ill Temper of the Nation to gain Proſelytes; Numbers are become Favourers of Popery, and are ready upon a ſlight Attack or Invitation to quit our Communion, for a Church that makes the greateſt noiſe about *Sacerdotal Powers*,

Powers, and a *regular uninterrupted Succeſſion*, &c. This Tendency to Popery, with Riots and Rebellions, and a ſettled Diſaffection to our true Conſtitution in Church and State, are the unhappy Fruits of Jacobitiſm.

§. 10. In conjunction with the Nonjurors, many who have not yet deſerted our Communion, forgetting their Duty and Relation to our Church and Government, are conſtantly employ'd in aſſaulting both; and if any Paper or Writer be conſider for Zeal in defending the Church and State, ſome of our falſe Brethren and pretended Churchmen immediately raiſe all the Clamours and Calumnies they can invent, and are as buſy to ſerve the *Jacobite* Cauſe, as if they had renounc'd our Communion, and declar'd for the *Pretender* and his Faction. With theſe Auxiliaries, and a Spirit of Fury and Defamation, the Nonjurors, from a ſmall and accidental Original, are grown up to *a Party, daring many bold things, and deſigning more.*

§. 11. The Biſhop of *Bangor* has for many Years been their Hatred, as now he is their Envy: But if Candour and Modeſty had any Influence upon the Men, they muſt have applauded the *Preſervative*; for it fairly repreſents our Strength, and the Weakneſs of the Cauſe of the Nonjurors: tho the laſt is ſufficiently done by themſelves, eſpecially in the Anſwers they have publiſh'd againſt the *Preſervative.*

The firſt Paper againſt the Preſervative *, which is the moſt ſpecious of the four I ſhall examine, tells his Reader, *pag.* 10. that "*Poſſeſſion* (he means of the Throne) "*is a thing purely accidental, but what are* "*properly call'd Principles are fix'd, and Right unalte-*"*rable.*" This is certainly true, if rightly taken. The Right of Nations to intruſt themſelves, and their Affairs, with ſuch Perſons and Families as they

* Layman's Conſiderations on the Bp of *Bangor*'s Preſervative.

ſhall

ſhall ſee reaſonable, is an unalterable Right; that is, Nations can't, *de Jure*, be diveſted of it by their *Truſtees*, tho, in Fact, it too often happens to be otherwiſe. This Right has often been exercis'd by our Nation, and by all our Neighbour Nations, as fully appears in Hiſtory. The Caſe of the *Stuarts* is a famous Inſtance of it: The Poſſeſſion of the Throne of *Scotland* by them was *purely accidental*, as the *Layman's* Words are; it was not fix'd by any *Divine Law*, nor by any Human Law, that gave the *Stuarts* an unalterable Right, but by an Act of the States or Parliament of *Scotland*. And is there any human poſitive Law, or Act of Parliament, in its own nature unalterable? Surely the *Layman* is a Gentleman of too much Senſe, and, I hope, of too much Candour, to affirm there is.

" §. 12. *The Preſervative*, he ſays, *is built upon two* " *Articles, that the King may deprive Biſhops, and the* " *People depoſe Kings*; *or alienate their Right by Acts of* " *their own, which they may have the Liberty to call* " *Acts of Parliament.*" Sir, ſaving the Impropriety of your Terms, what is there new or abſurd in this? In our, and all other Chriſtian Kingdoms, Princes have claim'd and exercis'd a Right of depriving Biſhops of their Temporalities, and of the Exerciſe of their Function too, within not only thoſe Biſhops Dioceſes, but their Prince's Dominions, by Impriſonment, Baniſhment, or expreſs Prohibitions. And our and all civiliz'd Nations have aſſerted and exercis'd their Right, as they ſaw occaſion, to depoſe or ſet aſide (not Kings, Sir, for they who are truly and properly ſuch, are not *de Jure* oppoſable or depoſable) but Tyrants, that is, Enemies to their Country, and to Mankind. I need not put this Gentleman in mind of the Honours that were done, by erecting Statues to the Memory of *Harmodius* and *Ariſtogiton*, the Deliverers of their Country from *Hipparchus*. However he may judge by that of the

Senſe of the *Greeks* : But Examples would be infinite. The *Roman* Senate gave Sentence in ſuch Caſes, *Sueton. in Neron. cap.* 49. And the Emperor *Wenceſlaus* (the *German Sardanapalus*) was depos'd, *Communi Suffragio abrogatum Wenceſlao Imperium : Schonborn, de Poteſtate Electorum, in Electione & Degradatione Imperatorum.* I refer this Layman for Inſtances of this kind to the Hiſtories of *Sweden*, *Denmark*, *France*, *Spain*, and other *European* Monarchies. By which publick Acts he will find not only the publick Peace and Liberties have been preſerv'd, but thoſe very *Monarchies* have been eſtabliſh'd upon a more laſting Foundation. When National Aſſemblies have before them an Affair of this nature, they can't be properly ſaid *to alienate a Right*, for that was before either forfeited or abdicated ; but rather to aſſert their *own* Rights, and to ſettle their *own* Affairs, which every private Man may do : And ſuch National Aſſemblies will always take a liberty to ſtile their own Acts by what Names they think fit, how improper ſoever it may appear to this Gentleman : Who has not conſider'd that Nations have laſted after the Extinction of ſeveral Regal Families ; and whenever that has happen'd, the Supreme Power was ſolely in the *Eſtates* or National Aſſemblies : who acting in the higheſt Capacity, and with an Abſolute and Sovereign Power, may therefore give what Stile or Denomination they pleaſe to their own Acts ; by which Acts they create new Regal Families, or new Forms of Government, and diſpoſe of themſelves and their Affairs by an Independent and Unlimited Authority.

But the Power and Authority of Regal Families, ſet up by National Aſſemblies, muſt be limited in the nature of the thing, becauſe 'tis morally impoſſible to conceive an Aſſembly of reaſonable Men

---

* Cicero pro Milone.

ſhould

ſhould derive a Power *from* themſelves *againſt* themſelves: Such Acts are null, even in private Caſes, by our and the *Roman* Law. To plead therefore for abſolute Submiſſion, or Obedience to limited Power, is abſurd: And to ſuppoſe ſuch Obedience to be an Apoſtolical Principle, as the *Author of the Layman's brief Obſervations*, &c. *pag.* 10. ſeems to do, is more abſurd. And as for his *two antient Apoſtolical Principles of Obedience to the Civil Magiſtrate, and the Rights of the Holy Catholick Church*, they will not be diſputed when rightly ſtated. 'Tis the abſurd and ſtupid Senſe of thoſe Doctrines propos'd by the Nonjurors, that only is rejected, and ought to be rejected. My Lord, let them be *Anathema*, whoever they be, who are for giving a Sanction to *Tyranny* or *Anarchy*. *Let the Rights of Princes be ſacred, and let the Rights of Nations be as ſacred:* But let not unskilful angry Men take upon them to call that the Prince's Right, or the People's Duty, which is nothing leſs: Let them not preſume to ſtile Abſurdities Apoſtolick Doctrines, and Doctrines of our Church, and then call in the *French* or the *Swedes* to perſuade us to believe them.

§. 13. *We know the Church and State to be diſtinct things*, p. 12. and that Obedience is due to the Laws of each. But then that Obedience is a reaſonable Act, and is to be govern'd by the Laws of each Society, and not by the arbitrary Dictates of Princes, either Secular or Spiritual. The Chriſtian Laws of higheſt Authority are contain'd in the *Chriſtian Code*, the New Teſtament; we are bound to the ſtricteſt Obſervance of them. But for "*true Faith and Allegiance* "*to the Authority lodg'd in Eccleſiaſtical Bodies, by* "*Succeſſion from the Apoſtles*," pag. 12. as the Terms are new, ſo the Notion is falſe, and has miſled a great part of *Chriſtendom* into an open Reſiſtance of the Supreme Power and Authority of the ſacred *Canons* of the Holy Scriptures. Mankind are ſo prone to become the Servants of Men, and *Eccleſiaſtical Bodies*

have been ſo apt to diſpenſe with the Service of God, that they have no good reaſon to expect "*we ſhould* "*look upon their Deciſions in ſpiritual Affairs*, as obli- "gatory as the Laws of a Civil Power are upon Ec- "cleſiaſticks in Civil Affairs," as this Lay-Gentleman would have it. Reaſonable Men ought to ſtand oblig'd to their own Acts and Deeds, and to the certain Laws of God; but to be oblig'd by the Acts of Perſons, who are not our Delegates or Repreſentatives, who act not, and pretend not to act by our Appointment or Conſent, but without it and againſt it, is not reaſonable without Deliberation.

§. 14. This Lay-Gentleman acquaints us, pag. 13. "*'Tis for want of conſidering the Diſtinction of Civil and* "*Eccleſiaſtical Authority, that a Difference in Religion* "*has been imagin'd to excuſe our Allegiance, and make* "*an Alteration in Civil Right: whereas*, ſays he, *in* "*reality they are two very different Queſtions; Whether* "*a Prince, tho a Papiſt, has a Right to reign over us? And whether, as a Prince, he has a Right to impoſe* "*his own Religion upon us? The laſt, if not deny'd*, he "ſays, *will bring us back to our former Confuſion*, (I "ſuppoſe he means to Popery;) *but if the firſt be not* "*anſwer'd in the Affirmative, it will*, he ſays, *make* "*Right very precarious, and our Kingdom little better* "*than Elective.*" The ſecond Queſtion he anſwers right, but as to the firſt Queſtion, he only ſays there will follow two Inconveniences, if that Queſtion be not anſwer'd affirmatively; that is, if we won't affirm, *That a Prince, tho a Papiſt, has a Right to reign over us*, then his *Right will be very precarious, and the Kingdom little better than Elective.* I anſwer; If Mankind were generally wiſe and good, an elective Succeſſion would be the beſt; but in the preſent State of Things, the Hereditary is certainly better, to avoid Parties and Conflicts at every Demiſe. But then no Hereditary Succeſſion can be eſtabliſh'd, or was indeed ever eſtabliſh'd with an *abſolute Non-obſtante* to all future Incapacities or Male-adminiſtration

tion whatever. This very Gentleman, *pag.* 15. ſays, *Lunacy, or Natural Incapacity are virtually excepted in States, as well as private Families*, being of a Civil Nature. The Right of Succeſſion ariſes from the firſt Settlement, or from a conſtant tacit Conſent to the Succeſſion of the next Lineal Heir; but this Settlement and this Conſent are reaſonable Acts of reaſonable Creatures, who never intended to reſign themſelves and their Heirs to an Enemy, or an *Apollyon* of the State: yet this ſtupid Hypotheſis muſt be the Foundation of all our Conteſts with the *Nonjurors*, or another Notion that is worſe, *viz.* That God, tho an infinitely wiſe and good Being, has deliver'd up great *Cantons* of Mankind to certain Regal Families, and their Heirs after them, with a Title Indefeaſible and Unchangeable either by thoſe Princes or the People; tho the greateſt and moſt general publick Good might accrue from ſuch a Change: which is a Principle ſo highly reflecting on both the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of Almighty God, and ſo confident an Aſſertion, without ground upon, and indeed with very little countenance from the Holy Scriptures, that 'tis ſtrange any Perſon of attentive Reflection ſhould maintain ſo monſtrous and ſo abſurd an Hypotheſis.

§. 15. The Nonjurors, as was hinted before, are forc'd to allow, "*That a* * *Lunatick or Idiot may be coerced,* "*put under the Reſtraint of a Regency, which is an ef-*"*fectual Excluſion from Government; and this becauſe* "*he is wholly uncapable of anſwering the Ends of Go-*"*vernment. This is ſo plain, that all, even the moſt* "*unwilling, acknowledg it in the Caſe of Idiocy or Mad-*"*neſs. The End of Government is acknowledg'd the* "*ſufficient only Reaſon for ſetting aſide Lunaticks or* "*Idiots, and therefore the ſame End of Government* "*holds equally in all parallel Caſes.*——*If a Prince has*

* *Biſhop's* Preſervative, *pag.* 21, 22.

"*any*

" *any Principles in him that oblige him to deſtroy us* " (*and our Conſtitution*) *he is uncapable to preſerve us,* " *and make us happy: But a Prince, fully poſſeſs'd by* " *the Popiſh Religion, is under the Command of Princi-* " *ples, which teach him that 'tis his Duty to deſtroy us;* " *and therefore he muſt have the greateſt of all Incapa-* " *cities.*" The Biſhop adds, " *Becauſe an Idiot or* " *Lunatick may be reſtrain'd, but a Bigot may not.*" I add alſo, that a Popiſh Prince of Cunning and Courage has the greateſt Opportunity of ruining his Proteſtant Subjects, and ſubverting the Laws and Conſtitution. *Idiots* and *Lunaticks* cannot govern themſelves, much leſs a Kingdom; but then they have not Senſe to deſtroy it: whereas a crafty Prince, whoſe Notions are inconſiſtent with the Government he is to exerciſe, cannot, in virtue of thoſe Principles, but change or deſtroy the Government. The Miſchief in theſe two Caſes differs juſt as much, as the Enmity of a Fool or a Madman differs from the Enmity of a crafty politick Enemy. If Idiocy or Lunacy then be an Incapacity allow'd in all Times, and in all Nations, *Popiſh Bigotry* is a far greater Incapacity in our and all Proteſtant Nations. The Lay-Gentleman, who remarks upon the Biſhop of *Bangor* * (as was ſaid before) admits " *Lunacy, or* " *Natural Incapacity to be of a Civil Nature, and vir-* " *tually excepted in States as well as private Families;* " *but Moral Incapacity,* he ſays, *is of another nature,* " *and never interrupts the Succeſſion in a Family, with-* " *out the concurrent Will of the Teſtator,* &c." Which is a great Miſtake; for Treaſon and Felony are Moral Incapacities, which interrupt and extinguiſh Succeſſion in private Families; and ſo does *Popery* here, as well as *Proteſtantiſm* in *France.* And Popery is ſuch a Moral Incapacity, as obliges its Votaries to uſe all their power to deſtroy Hereticks by Fire and Sword,

* Layman's Conſiderations on the Biſhop of *Bangor's* Arguments, *pag.* 15.

to

to overturn Proteſtant States and Governments, to violate Oaths, Treaties, and the moſt ſacred Obligations; ſo that 'tis not poſſible for a Man, in a moral Senſe, to be more incapable of any Truſt, than a Popiſh Prince is of a Proteſtant Government. The Lay-Gentleman thinks the Biſhop concludes too much from the Incapacity of one Popiſh Prince to the Excluſion of all his Popiſh Heirs; but if Popery be it ſelf an abſolute Incapacity, that being equally in all Popiſh Heirs, ought equally to exclude them all, as incapable of exerciſing a Proteſtant Government.

§. 16. The Lay-Gentleman argues to this effect, *pag.* 15. that "*If a Heathen Prince muſt be ſubmitted* "*to, by* Rom. 13. *then a Papiſt, who is leſs dangerous,* "*may be ſubmitted to.*" Submiſſion was due to a Heathen Emperor, and is due to a Popiſh Prince, unleſs he and his Heirs are excluded by the Conſtitution. Chriſtians in early Ages ſubmitted to the Civil Laws, and Governors in being; the Conſtitution was againſt them, but is for us. A Pagan Prince govern'd a Pagan State by Pagan Laws: We are a Proteſtant Nation, and have a Proteſtant Conſtitution, to which our Princes owe Submiſſion, ſo as to make it the Rule of their Government, which a Popiſh Prince can't do; and if he can't rule us by our Laws, he can't rule us at all, for we can be govern'd no other ways. The Primitive Chriſtians had no Laws to defend them from *Paganiſm*, we have Laws to defend us againſt *Popery*; which they can't do, if they are not executed, and that will never be by a Popiſh Prince. The Primitive Chriſtians as Men muſt be ſubject in Temporals to ſome Civil Government; they had no Chriſtian Civil Government for the firſt three Centuries, and therefore they ſubmitted to the Pagan Civil Powers in all Countries where they dwelt; as our Travellers do, except in religious Matters alone. Had the Laws of the *Roman* State excluded a Pagan or Tyrannical Emperor, St. *Paul* had been the laſt Man in the whole *Roman* Empire, who

who would have pleaded for Obedience to him, or for his Reſtauration. The Peace of Nations, and the Rights of Mankind, were of greater account, and of higher value in the Judgment of the inſpir'd Writers, than the imaginary and moſt unreaſonable Claim of any Tyrannical Prince, who had a Right to nothing but the Vengeance of the *Senate*.

When St. *Paul* taught Submiſſion to *the Powers in being*, 'twas to the Juſt and Righteous Laws of the Empire, which were in Civil Matters the only proper Rule of Obedience, and not the Will and Pleaſure of a Wicked and Tyrannical *Nero*; whom for the Good of the whole Empire, had the Chriſtians then been a Majority, they would have certainly depos'd, becauſe *Nero* reſiſted the Ordinance of God (*viz.* a Good and Juſt Government) more than any one Man in the whole Empire.

§. 17. Well, but this Lay-Gentleman tells us, *p.* 15. that " *when St.* Paul *taught Submiſſion to the Powers in* " *being, the Chriſtians at* Rome *labour'd under the Yoke* " *of Tyranny and Perſecution; and the then Emperor was* " *a Man of moſt vicious Morals. Now I hope one* " *will ſay, that Popery is more dangerous than Paga-* " *or which is the ſame, that a Heathen who endeavour'd* " *to propagate Idolatry, and perſecuted all that believed* " *in Chriſt, was to be ſubmitted to as their Civil Go-* " *vernour; and yet a Popiſh Prince to be voted incapable* " *of Ruling us, as a Civil Eſtabliſhment, merely becauſe* " *he is not a Proteſtant!*"

Anſw. 1. St. *Paul* taught Submiſſion to juſt Power as a Duty, and to unjuſt irreſiſtible Violence, as prudent.

2. Popery is really more dangerous than ſome ſorts of Paganiſm to the Rights and Liberties of Mankind; a Fact which no one, who reads Foreign Hiſtory, can be ignorant of.

3. A few Chriſtians, without any Publick Eſtabliſhment, were to ſubmit to a Heathen; when a Majority of Chriſtians, whoſe Religion is eſtabliſh'd, are

Cuſtoms without Law, and his aſſuming a Diſpenſing Power above the Law, were in the nature of the thing a Voluntary Abdication of the Limited Government he had ſworn to: and *his Flight* was, at leaſt in his own Thoughts, a *Compulſive Abdication*, and indeed was the juſt Conſequence of his *Voluntary Abdication*. And it was alſo the greateſt Bleſſing, at that time, that could have happen'd to our Church and Nation, except his Death, which follow'd in God's time, after he had been mortify'd with the greateſt Diſappointments, and fill'd up the Meaſure of his Sins; particularly that Sin of the greateſt Size, and deepeſt Dye, *viz.* his endeavouring to overthrow our Conſtitution, which he was ſworn to maintain.

§. 21. In vain does this Gentleman, *p.* 17. amuſe himſelf and his Readers with a Diſtinction between *Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtical Power*, which the *Biſhop* did by no means forget, but expreſly mentions again and again. And whereas the Gentleman is pleaſed to inculcate the Notion of a *Spiritual Relation between the Biſhop and his Dioceſs, and affirms it to be indiſſoluble by Civil Power*; he is deſir'd to conſider,

1. That the Parliaments and Convocation in Queen *Elizabeth*'s * Reign had no ſuch Notion. The Parliament not only depriv'd all Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, and made void their Preferments, who refus'd the Oath of Supremacy, but diſabled ſuch from retaining or exerciſing any Office or Promotion during Life. And the Act of Uniformity 1662, by ſeveral Clauſes, made Biſhops and all other Eccleſiaſticks deprivable by that Statute; and the Vacancies were fill'd in both Reigns without the leaſt Thought of the indiſſoluble Relation of the Deprived.

Anſw. 2. *This Indiſſoluble Relation* is no Scripture-Notion, was not taught by our firſt Reformers, nor by the Primitive Fathers; but is a late Opinion

* 1° Eliz. c. 1.

leſs, whilſt he continues a *Papiſt*; and to fancy he would not, as the *Layman* ſpeaks, is great Weakneſs, or diſſembling his real Opinion: for did he ever know any Popiſh Prince, in any Proteſtant Country, that fail'd in his Duty to the Papal Intereſt, when 'twas in his power? But we are at preſent otherwiſe engag'd, God be prais'd, and ſhall not make a trial of the Unanimity of the Church in aſſerting her Rights, which we ſhould have little reaſon to expect from abundance of her Members; who are little acquainted with her Conſtitution, and would, too many of 'em, value a Prince's Favour above any Religion in the World.

§. 20. This Gentleman in his 16th Page is pleas'd to acquaint us with his Notion of the word *Abdication*, which he ſays the *Romans* underſtood to be, "*when a Magiſtrate or Officer voluntarily reſign'd his* "*Truſt, and lived a private Member of the ſame Com-*"*munity; which is beſt underſtood by reading* Roman "*Writers. Now* (ſays he) *this was ſo far from being the* "*Caſe of the late King* James, *that he fled for his Per-*"*ſonal Security, and continu'd claiming till his Death.*" I know this has paſs'd current among many, and ſome who ſhould know better, for many years, as the true and only Notion of the word *Abdication*. But had this *Lay-Gentleman*, or his Friend, well conſider'd the *Roman Writers*, he would have found often in thoſe Writers a *Compulſive* as well as a *Voluntary Abdication*; in *Livy* particularly: *Coegerunt abdicare ſe Magiſtratu*, will be found in that *Hiſtorian* again and again: And the *Civilians* in their Books are no Strangers to that Phraſe. So that I wonder this *Layman* ſhould mention *Roman Hiſtorians*, and be at the ſame time a Stranger to the Senſe of the word *Abdication*. The late King *James*'s Abdication was in both ſenſes; all the parts of his Male-Adminiſtration, recited in the *Bill of Rights* *, *particularly his raiſing the*

* 1° Will. & Mary.

Cuſtoms

founded on Dr. *Hicks*'s Scheme of a *Spiritual Monarchy*. The *New Teſtament* acquaints us with the mutual Duties of Paſtor and People; but no where inſiſts upon ſuch a ſpiritual Relation, *&c.* as is not to be diſſolv'd by the Civil Power. And the firſt Chriſtian Emperors frequently diſſolv'd that Relation, as appears by divers Facts related by *Euſebius*, *Theodoret*, *Socrates*, and *Sozomen*.

Anſw. 3. 'Tis obſervable that the ſame Perſons who have coin'd the *Divine Right of Kings to their Kingdoms*, now begin to aſſert *a Divine Right of Biſhops to their Dioceſes*, and the *Divine Right of the Clergy to their Benefices*; and pray why not a *Divine Right of the Poor to the Alms of the Pariſh?* What a wild and vagrant Notion have theſe Men of *Divine Right?* Poor *unhappy Laity! you are bound and muſt obey both your Spiritual and Secular Princes, be they never ſo wicked, there's no Remedy from your ſelves*, till they are pleas'd to diſſolve the Relation themſelves.

§. 22. Well! but whence does this indiſſoluble Relation between a Biſhop and his Dioceſe ariſe? Why hence, as this Gentleman tells us; "*A Man is ordain'd to ſomewhat, and a Biſhop conſecrated to ſomewhat*, i. e. *not only for the Exerciſe of a Miniſterial or Epiſcopal Authority, but for the executing of it in this or that Pariſh or Dioceſe; and this before Chriſtianity had the Protection of the Civil Government.*" Admit this, how does it appear by this account, that the Relation between the Biſhop and his Dioceſe is indiſſoluble by the Civil Power? If this were true, the Dioceſes of the Biſhops, whom many Chriſtian Emperors baniſh'd, muſt have remain'd vacant; which yet, we all know, were fill'd by new Biſhops. Our Laws take no notice of this pretended indiſſoluble Relation: K. *Henry* VIII. diſmember'd ſeveral Biſhopricks, and erected five new ones by *Letters Patents*, without the leaſt Oppoſition for infringing this pretended indiſſoluble Relation. *Tunſtal* Biſhop of *Durham* was depriv'd of his Biſhoprick

in

are not bound to ſubmit to a Heathen, or a Papiſt endeavouring to ſubvert it: for their Eſtabliſhment is a part, and the beſt part of the *Powers* that be, or of the *Ordinance of God*, &c. to which they are to ſubmit.

4. A Popiſh Prince cannot rule us by Proteſtant Laws, as abundance of our Statutes are; and they are ſuch Laws too, as I hope we chiefly value: and therefore voting ſuch a Prince incapable of ruling us, is our declaring what he knew in his own Conſcience was true.

§. 18. But the Lay-Gentleman hopes no one will ſay, *That Popery is more dangerous than Paganiſm.* I anſwer certainly 'tis, in ſome reſpects, than ſome ſorts of Paganiſm, under which Chriſtians may live peaceably and ſafely: but under Popiſh Governments there is no Medium betwixt Popery and Perſecution. He goes on; "*A Heathen propagating* "*Idolatry, and perſecuting Chriſtians, was to be ſub-* "*mitted to as their Civil Governour.*" If he means by St. *Paul*'s Doctrine ſuch Submiſſion was due, it muſt be underſtood in all things juſt, reaſonable, and prudent. To be quiet was their Province, who had it not in their power to remedy the Diſorders of the *Roman* Government; which great good Work, if others neglected, to whom it belong'd, and quietly ſuffer'd good Government, the Ordinance of God, to be trampled on, they were inexcuſable.

§. 19. But the Lay-Gentleman ſays, *p.* 16. "*Sup-* "*poſe it be allow'd, that a Popiſh Prince has once en-* "*deavour'd the Subverſion of the Civil Conſtitution,* "*will it therefore follow that every Roman Catholick* "*Prince will certainly do the ſame?*" Who is this Gentleman? What has he to do to put ſuch an abſurd Queſtion, when all is ſettled? If this Gentleman be a Papiſt, he *does not doubt* but a Popiſh King would ſubvert our Proteſtant Conſtitution: And if he be a Proteſtant, he *can't doubt* it, unleſs he wants common Senſe. For a Papiſt, as ſuch, profeſſes himſelf an Enemy to our Conſtitution, and can be no

that claims and maintains a Power of *depoſing Kings, and of impoſing Tyrants*, to which no Man can be a greater Enemy than the Biſhop, whether that Power be pretended to by the Pope or the People. And as to the *depriving Power*, the Biſhop alſo is very well content it ſhould ſtand upon the foot of our *Statute*, *Common* and *Canon* Laws; and that will be attended with no ſuch melancholy Conſequence, as this Gentleman would inſinuate. It was but reaſonable to acquaint the Gentleman with this, becauſe he and his Friends have plainly told the World what the whole Nation is to expect from the Scheme of the Nonjurors.

And now, my Lord, I begin with the ſecond Anſwer * to the *Preſervative*; and to give your Lordſhip an Idea of this Writer, I need only mention a Paſſage, *pag.* 1, and 2. "*The exact Parallel* "(ſays he) *between Idiots, Lunaticks, and the Popiſh* "*Line, is ſo plain and irrefragably clear, that it can no* "*longer ſure be deem'd a Revolution* (I ſuppoſe he meant a probable Notion or Opinion) "*but a fix'd* "*and unalterable Principle.*" In this he concurs with the Biſhop ſo far, as to think, *Whoever ſhould in the leaſt pretend to diſpute it, cannot put in a Claim to common Senſe*, as he ſays the Laity do, *pag.* 1. and very juſtly too: tho this Paſſage, I confeſs, can hardly be reconcil'd to common Senſe, however it may happen to be this Gentleman's Senſe; and therefore I leave him to anſwer for it.

§. 24. He can't forbear ſhewing his great Concern for the Nonjurors; a little for the Biſhop, had look'd well: he owns indeed, *pag.* 3. that "*every Act of* "*Treaſon committed by Eccleſiaſticks in or out of the* "*Exerciſe of their Offices, comes directly under the* "*Sanction of the Civil Powers.*" And are not treaſo-

* *Smith*'s Conſiderations on the Biſhop of *Bangor*'s Preſervative, *pag.* 1, 2.

nable

nable Principles, openly maintain'd, treaſonable Acts? They who diſown the whole Frame and preſent Conſtitution of our Government, ſure cannot pretend to ask liberty to have publick Meetings, which would be Aſſemblies of profeſs'd Rebels; yet this Gentleman, who has more regard for them than the Church and Biſhop with whom he pretends to hold Communion, is become their Advocate, and is ſo bold as to offer at diſguiſing the Biſhop's Reaſoning; for he inſinuates, *that the mere Exerciſe of the holy Function by the Nonjuring Clergy, can do no hurt to the State.* 'Tis very true, mere praying and preaching cannot hurt the State; but praying and preaching ſeditiouſly may, and the aſſembling of Perſons of ſeditious and traitorous Principles may; which is what the Biſhop by his Principles plainly oppoſes. And to ſtate the Caſe otherwiſe, looks like a Deſign to render the Biſhop or his Notions odious; as indeed ſeveral Paſſages too plainly, tho not honeſtly, endeavour at throout the Book: As for inſtance, in *pag.* 4. where he pleads for a Toleration for his Friends the Nonjurors, he is pleas'd to ſay, *He thinks their Nonjuring ought not to be made a Reaſon to deprive them of Holy Orders.* Nor does the Biſhop think it ought, nor does any body elſe that I know: But has not this Writer Senſe or Candour enough to diſtinguiſh between Deprivation *ab Officio*, and Deprivation *ab Executione Officii pro hic & nunc?* Do our Acts of Parliament, or did any Civil Power in King *William*'s, or Queen *Anne*'s, or now in King *George*'s Reign, take upon it to deprive the Clergy of Holy Orders for *Nonjurancy?* No ſuch matter has been attempted, or ſo much as thought on; tho it can't be ſaid ſome of them ha'nt well deſerv'd it, for a moſt extravagant Profanation of religious Aſſemblies, with riotous ſeditious Diſcourſes.

§. 25. *But the Exerciſe of the Chriſtian Prieſthood is neither Treaſon nor Rebellion*, ſays Mr. *S—th*, *p.* 10. Moſt certainly the proper Exerciſe is not; but the abuſive Exerciſe

Exerciſe of it by ſeveral Nonjurors moſt certainly has been; of which he muſt remember ſome late notorious Inſtances among the Rebels, and I wiſh there were none ſuch to be met with amongſt thoſe who have taken the Oaths. Does it become a ſound Member of our Church to exaſperate his Readers by inſiſting upon it, that the Biſhop muſt mean a *total Deprivation*, (*Conſiderations*, pag. 21.) contrary to abundance of expreſs words *, and to very plain Paſſages in the *Preſervative*, and ſome of them cited by this Layman? Upon this falſe Suppoſition he enlarges, ſhewing *what the Apoſtles did, notwithſtanding they were oppos'd by the Civil Power:* And who is there that doubts, that not only an *Apoſtle*, but every Chriſtian is bound, as he can, to reaſon and perſuade the World to be wiſe and good, all human Powers and Laws to the contrary notwithſtanding? Such part of a Preacher's Office, or of a private Chriſtian's Duty, no Civil, no Canonical Deprivation can hinder the Execution of; but if Preachers, upon Principle not diſguis'd, but openly profeſs'd, are Enemies to a Government, and upon Principle too Friends to its greateſt Enemies, has the Civil Power no Right to deprive ſuch of their Civil Privileges? And ſuch are their Benefices, *&c.* which are the Alms of the

---

* *Upon thoſe Words of the Act* (1 W. & M.) [deriv'd from their Offices] *the Biſhop gloſſes, ſaying, the* Deprivation *here ſpoken of* is from a Right to execute their Office. *And*, p. 40. The Lay-Power does not concern it ſelf with the Power within. *And*, p. 55. The Civil Power may hinder their actual Exerciſe of their Office, whenever, *&c.* *And again*, p. 65. *It is abſolutely neceſſary to the Being of the Civil Power, that any Eccleſiaſtick ſhould be depriv'd of his* Right to the Exerciſe of his Office, *if that be inconſiſtent with the Safety of the State; which was the Caſe of* Abiathar *in* Solomon's *Reign:* Now that is all that is included in the Deprivation we are ſpeaking of, *&c.* *And therefore tho it may be ſaid, that Deprivations upon other Accounts muſt be perform'd by a ſpiritual Authority, yet this does not, becauſe a Matter of a Civil Nature muſt belong to the Civil Power.* *And more to the ſame purpoſe in ſeveral other Places.*

State;

" the Exerciſe of his Function, to which he was " appointed according to the Inſtitution of God, " and the ſame *Solomon* appointed another to ſuc- " ceed him. What can be a more expreſs Parallel " than this, of the ſupreme Civil Power depriving " one Eccleſiaſtical Perſon, and putting in another, " upon the ſole Conſideration of the Intereſt of the " State?" Mr. *Sm——th* is ſhock'd with this In- ſtance, and with a hard ſhift gets thro it, but not without leaving ſome Marks of unfair Dealing, and (I really think) Scruples in his Mind. He will have, *thruſting* Abiathar *out from being Prieſt*, to ſignify, *taking away the Endowments of the Crown, always beſtow'd on their Perſons* (I ſuppoſe he means his Prefer- ments) *and his Baniſhment*. Well, and what was this leſs or other than Deprivation, that is, from the Execution of his Office? which is all the Biſhop pro- duces it for. *But it was not a total Deprivation*, ſays Mr. *Sm——th*: He means, I ſuppoſe, he was not de- priv'd of his Prieſtly Office, or ſacred Character: Be it ſo, there's no hurt done to the Biſhop's Cauſe. Mr. *Sm——th* allows *Abiathar* was depriv'd of his Preferments, and baniſh'd, which is full enough to the Biſhop's purpoſe; for he could not act or exe- cute his Office of High Prieſt but at *Jeruſalem*, ſo the Execution of his Office ceas'd. I would only take no- tice by the by, that Mr. *Sm—th* gives a very inſuffi- cient Reaſon for his not being totally depriv'd, " *Be-* " *cauſe he was call'd High Prieſt afterwards in the 4th* " *Chapter of* 1 Kings." *Anſw.* So he was before his Deprivation, and this was enough to give him place amongſt all that had been and were *Solomon*'s Chiefs, who are *both* mention'd in the 4th Chapter.

§. 27. This Gentleman objects further, *That the Caſe of* Abiathar *can be no Parallel, becauſe* Solomon *was an extraordinary Perſon*. He was ſo in ſome Ca- ſes, but in this it plainly appears, that *Solomon* diſ- plac'd him for his factious Adherence to *Adonijah*.

Again

Again, Mr. *Sm—th* objects, "*That this was done, "to fulfil the Word of the Lord.*" Yes, in the Event, but not in *Solomon*'s Design; his Aim was to secure the Throne, by displacing his Enemies. But Mr. *Sm---th* "*thinks his Lordship will be inclin'd, upon Re-"view, to think it doubtful, whether it was a Deprivation in the Sense here contended.*" By no means; for 'tis past doubt with the Bishop, and with any attentive Reader, that it was a Deprivation of *Abiathar* from the Execution of his Priestly Office, for his Adherence to *Adonijah*, *Solomon*'s Competitor. And let him consider the Passage a thousand times, and he can make nothing less of it. He acknowledges, *pag.* 27. "*The Civil Power may deprive Ec-"clesiasticks of Diocese, Revenues, Honours,* &c. *and "Life it self; but not their Orders, so as to make them "cease to be Bishops.*" This will be all granted him, and is already imply'd in abundance thro the Bishop's Discourse, as I have shewn before: So that all his first 27 Pages have been combating a Phantom of his own Brain, a Position no where maintain'd, but often caution'd against by the Bishop; which when Mr. *Sm---th* is pleas'd to consider well, he will be sorry he should give himself and the Bishop so much unnecessary Trouble, and impose upon his unwary Readers so unfairly. What must some prejudic'd Readers think of the Bishop, when they find this Gentleman telling them very gravely, *pag.* 27, 28. that *there's nothing in the Episcopal or Priestly Office inconsistent with the Power of Kings, or the Security of Civil Power?* Who says or thinks there is? What does the Gentleman mean? The Bishop neither expresses nor implies any such thing in his *Preservative*. Again, in *pag.* 30, 31. *The Function*, says he, *ought not to be punish'd, but the Mistake.* If Mistakes could be punish'd, I would gladly have this Gentleman's Mistakes, tho not his Person, severely punish'd; for thro want of Candour, or due Consideration, he mistakes so *palpably* the Bishop's Meaning in the Points

Points upon which he pretends to argue with the Bishop, and perverts his Sentiments so *grossly*, that whoever reads Mr. *Sm---th*, and does not read the Bishop, will certainly conclude, that the Bishop maintains *that Lay-Powers can deprive Ecclesiasticks of Holy Orders.* And this Insinuation runs thro Mr. *Sm---th*'s first 27 Pages of his *Considerations*, as I said before.

§. 28. The Gentleman in *pag.* 29. banters his Readers, telling them, " *That the Church of* Eng- " land *never thought it a Contradiction to fear God, and* " *honour the King*; *what then*, says he, *can render De-* " *privation of her Ministers necessary to the Security of* " *the Civil Powers?*" Does not he know that the *Nonjurors* think it a Contradiction to fear God, and honour King *GEORGE?* Has the King then not power to secure himself and the State against such Enemies? Nay, Mr. *Sm---th* is so bold as to insinuate, *There's of late a Jealousy of the Function it self*; which is altogether true as to the Nonjurors: of the Sedition, and of the rebellious Principles of such, the *State* is, and has reason to be jealous, because they are industrious to shew them, and boast of them in all Places. " *O but it has ever been the peculiar Glory* " *of the Church of* England, *not only to teach the con-* " *trary, but to condemn every Tendency* (to Disloyalty he means) " *whether it came from* Rome *or* Geneva." To teach and to practise Obedience to Government by the Rules of the Gospel, is the Duty of every Christian Church; and the Church of *England* has rightly stated that Duty in her Homilies: But some of her Divines have notoriously misrepresented that Duty, and laid those Stumbling-Blocks before the Nonjurors, which at this day makes them Rebels in Principle against the present Government. And whatever Opinions, contrary to Loyalty, truly so call'd, have been propagated by some, who have receiv'd their Notions from *Rome* or *Geneva*; I fear there are others who have imbib'd Opinions at *Ox-*

ford

ford and *Cambridge*, equally dangerous to all Government, properly ſo call'd, and utterly inconſiſtent with our *Monarchy* and *Conſtitution*; and when they have embrac'd ſuch falſe and dangerous Notions, preſently they have the Aſſurance to call them *Oxford* or *Cambridge Loyalty*, and *the Doctrine of the Church forſooth*, skreening their pernicious Errors under thoſe *venerable Names*. 'Tis by ſuch Teachers that this Gentleman, Mr. *Sm--th*, has been unhappily influenc'd in his Opinions, which have had ſo great an Aſcendant over his Reaſon, as to give him a wrong Biaſs, and to diſable him from reading the *Preſervative* with his common Intelligence or Integrity. For he goes on ſtill to ſpeak of *totally depriving ſome of their Holy Orders*, &c. as if the Civil Government had ſo depriv'd them, and the Biſhop had vindicated ſuch a Deprivation. And upon this falſe miſtaken Suppoſition, Mr. *Sm---th* ſtarts ſeveral Particulars, that reflect upon the Biſhop and the Government too. *Pag.* 32. He tells his Readers, *There's a Variety of Civil Penalties, of which the Government may take its Choice.* This ſuppoſes Deprivation of Nonjurors by Act of Parliament, to be an *Eccleſiaſtical Penalty inflicted by Civil Authority*. Let him read the Act of Uniformity, 1662. and ſee if he don't find the Civil Powers then enacting Deprivation, which was actually executed upon many Hundreds. However, that Deprivation was a Civil Deprivation, it did not extend to their Holy Orders, ſo as totally to deprive them of them; nor does a like Civil Deprivation of the Nonjurors take away their Powers conferr'd in Ordination; nor does the Government or the Biſhop ſuppoſe it does. 'Tis true, the Nonjurors can't *exerciſe their Function here*, but the Government would be very well pleas'd if they'd withdraw and preach in the *Eaſt* or *Weſt-Indies*. The World is wide, and when they have left *Britain*, there's ſtill before them *Campus dicendi ampliſſimus*. In doing ſo, they'd oblige the Nation, and the poor Heathens whom they ſhould convert;

convert; God forbid they ſhould ſtay here till they are *impriſon'd*, *baniſh'd*, or *hang'd*, which Mr. *Sm--th* mentions, *pag.* 32. as ſome of the Civil Penalties which the Government might chuſe.

§. 29. After this tedious wrangling in behalf of the *Nonjurors*, this Gentleman at laſt turns ſhort upon them, *pag.* 33. for he ſeems frankly to condemn the "*ſtrange Monopoly ſome of the Nonjurors* "*have made of all the Sacerdotal Powers and Privileges* "*which Chriſt* has given to his Church, *as wild and* "*extravagant*, &c. yet thinks the Blaſphemy and "Abſurdity charg'd on ſuch a *Claim of the Prieſt-* "*hood in general, admits of ſome Difficulty*, &c." And after ſome Cenſure upon the Biſhop, cites the whole 77th *pag.* of the *Preſervative*. Now the following Notions of the Nonjurors are there briefly repreſented, and afterwards confuted by the Biſhop: as, That "*there's no* * *Hope of the Favour of God*, "*but in a ſtrict Communion with the Nonjuring Church*, "*which is govern'd by a regular Succeſſion of Biſhops:* "That *God diſpenſes his Favours only by their Hands*, "*and their ſubordinate Prieſts:* That *you can't be au-* "*thoritatively bleſs'd, or releas'd from your Sins, but* "*by them who are the Regular Prieſts:* That *Churches* "*under other Biſhops are ſchiſmatical, excommunicate*, "*out of God's Favour.*" Now tho Mr. *Sm---th* blames the Nonjurors for appropriating the Sacerdotal Powers and Privileges to themſelves, yet he thinks the Biſhop to blame for ſeeming to diſallow of ſuch Powers to the Clergy in general. And he's ſo impatient of venting his Sentiments, that he takes up the Biſhop upon a general Clauſe, that's only preparatory to his following Arguments, and tells him, "*He ſhould not content himſelf, were there no-* "*thing to be ſaid to either Papiſt or Proteſtant, but a* "*general Harangue on the Juſtice and Goodneſs of* "*God.*" Nor does the Biſhop deſire his Readers to

* Principles of the Nonjurors.

be

be content with this, but furniſhes them with Arguments that are in themſelves ſatisfactory, and plainly overthrow the Foundation of the *Nonjurors Scheme*.

But this Gentleman begins with new Inſinuations: "*I muſt own*, ſays he, *Regular Ordination*, *Authoritative Benediction*, *Remiſſion*, *and the like*, *are Words* "*that ſeem to me to carry a good old meaning*." Yes Sir, thoſe words do more than ſeem, they do really contain in them a good Senſe, and they alſo have been apply'd to very ill Purpoſes, as you your ſelf obſerve, by *Papiſts* and *Nonjurors*; and 'tis their ill-grounded and ſuperſtitious Senſe alone that the Biſhop confutes; which if you had duly heeded, all the Trouble you are at to juſtify a *regular Miſſion* would have been excus'd: for that was always thought reaſonable, and will be always contended for by wiſe and good Men, particularly by the Biſhop of *Bangor*: And *Authoritative Benediction and Abſolution* are certainly good things, if by them we underſtand a Declaration, according to the Word of God, of his Favour and Good-will to the Pious and Penitent. And if Mr. *S---th* alſo will underſtand, by *Authoritative Binding or Anathematizing*, *a Denunciation according to the Word of God*, *of his Wrath and Diſpleaſure againſt the Impious and Impenitent*; this will readily be agreed. But if he or any others, Papiſts or Proteſtants, amuſe themſelves with ſuperſtitious and dark Notions of certain Powers lodg'd in ſome Perſons, and will have theſe to be neceſſary to our Salvation, they muſt prove it by plainer and ſtronger Arguments than have yet been offer'd by any Popiſh or Proteſtant Hand.

That *Chriſt*, *after his Aſcenſion*, *gave ſome Apoſtles*, &c. and gave them too extraordinary Powers, is not, cannot be deny'd.

That Perſons of the beſt Qualifications, ought to have a regular Ordination or Appointment to the Miniſtry, will be readily granted.

That ſuch ought to be held in due Eſteem for their Work and Office, as the Inſtruments under God, and Helps to us in working out our Salvation, is certainly true.

That ſuch can and ought, by Authority from the Word of God, to declare his Favour to *them that do well*, and his Wrath againſt *them that do Evil*, is moſt certain.

But that all the Powers convey'd to the Apoſtles by our Saviour, *Mat.* 16. & 19. and 18. 18. and *John* 20. 23. are in the ſame Degree and Kind convey'd from the Apoſtles by a regular Succeſſion of certain Perſons, down to the Clergy of the preſent Age, of any Communion; or that *Binding* and *Looſing*, *Retaining* and *Remitting*, *Bleſſing* and *Curſing*, are ſo intirely the Property and Prerogative of Perſons in Holy Orders, that they alone have the ſole Diſpoſal of them; or that theſe things, in paſſing thro their hands, and by being diſpens'd by them, have a ſingular Energy and peculiar Effects; or that conſtant recourſe is to be had to the Clergy, by Confeſſion, for Remiſſion, or for their Benediction; are Notions not to be met with in the Holy Scriptures, nor maintain'd by the beſt Authority in the Church of *England*. But 'tis the Cuſtom of others, and the Practice of this Writer, *pag.* 35. preſently to conclude, if their Notions of Prieſtly Powers are deny'd, or call'd in queſtion, immediately to inſinuate, that a regular Ordination is diſown'd. Even this Writer has the Modeſty to intimate, that a *regular outward Call to the Miniſtry*, is by the Biſhop deem'd a *Nicety*, than which nothing can be more untruly ſuggeſted. Yet this is not the laſt, nor the leaſt Impoſition by Mr. *Sm---th* upon his Readers: His Miſrepreſentations of the Biſhop come on thick in every Page, and ſeem to be altogether wilful, which have greatly ſurpriz'd his Readers in the 39th, 40th, 41ſt and 42d Pages; and 'tis not eaſy to ſay, whether they deſerve more Pity or Indignation, becauſe

becauſe they are, to any thing the Biſhop has ſaid in his *Preſervative*, altogether foreign and impertinent.

§. 30. The Biſhop is ſhewing, *pag.* 85, 86, 87. what Principle it is that juſtify'd the Proteſtants in ſetting up their own Biſhops, and ſeparating from the Church of *Rome*; and ſays, and that very truly too, that *'twas becauſe the Proteſtants were perſuaded, in their own Conſciences, that the Popiſh Doctrines and Worſhip were corrupt.* Who would think now that what is ſo juſt, and ſo certain as this, with the Illuſtration that follows, could offend, or that ſo plain and evident a Truth could be miſtaken by Mr. *Sm---th?* But ſo it is, for he makes this, *pag.* 43. *to be reſolving all Religion into an honeſt and ſincere Perſuaſion.* And upon this extravagant Conſtruction he ſets out with a freſh Retinue of trifling and abſurd Reflections, which a reaſonable Man would wonder ſhould ever enter into his Head, upon reading thoſe Pages in the *Preſervative*. What! becauſe one ought, to juſtify one's Separation, to be ſincerely perſuaded of the Reaſons and Grounds for it, will it follow, that all our Religion is reſolv'd into that Perſuaſion? Or that ſuch Perſuaſion is attain'd, without a ſincere Uſe of the *Holy Scriptures?* Or that the Biſhop had the leaſt Thought, that a *Proteſtant* could arrive at ſuch a Perſuaſion, without carefully reading the Word of God? Or that the *Scriptures* are not the Foundation of all our Religion?

§. 31. In the 45th Page, Mr. *Sm---th* falls foul upon the Biſhop, with theſe words: "*I would be the laſt* "*that ſhould quarrel about Words; but to find that* "*Authority inveſted in the Chriſtian Prieſthood, by Di-* "*vine Inſtitution, of bleſſing and abſolving the People,* "mention'd by your Lordſhip, *with an Air of Con-* "*tempt and Diſdain, gives me abundance of Concern.* "*Authoritative Benediction, a Term of Art! ſure, my* "*Lord, 'tis the Doctrine of our Church, it's the Doc-* "*trine of the Holy Scriptures.*" Now all this is ſaid,

without explaining his Terms, or attempting to prove his Notion of bleſſing and abſolving the People from the Word of God, without which it cannot be of Divine Inſtitution.

§. 32. He offers indeed to prove it to be the Doctrine of our Church, from theſe words; "*He hath given* "*Power and Commandment to his Miniſters to declare* "*and pronounce to his People, being penitent, the Abſo-* "*lution and Remiſſion of their Sins: He pardoneth* "*and abſolveth all them that truly repent,* &c." But this is nothing at all to his Authoritative Benediction, and plainly againſt his *Authoritative Abſolution veſted in the Chriſtian Prieſthood by Divine Inſtitution.* For, (1.) the words are expreſs, that *God hath given Power and Commandment to declare and pronounce Abſolution and Remiſſion*; not to abſolve and to remit. (2.) 'Tis as expreſs, that *He* (that is, God) *pardoneth and abſolveth,* &c. This is the modeſt, the cautious, the prudent, and humble Stile of our Church concerning *Abſolution.* And in the Office for the Sick, the firſt part of the Abſolution is merely *optative* or *precatory* (and ſo is that in the Communion-Service) that is, a wiſhing or praying, *that our Lord,* &c. *of his great Mercy would forgive,* &c. The latter part is expreſs'd with an Air of authoritative Abſolution, *By his Authority committed to me, I abſolve thee from all thy Sins.* But then this muſt be explain'd by the former Abſolution, which is fuller and plainer; and then the *Authority* committed to the Prieſt, is an Authority only to *declare and pronounce* to the truly Penitent: and when the Prieſt ſays, *I abſolve thee* from all thy Sins, it muſt be underſtood, I declare, *that God abſolves thee from all thy Sins*; otherwiſe it could not agree with what is expreſly ſaid in the firſt Abſolution, *viz. That God pardoneth and abſolveth all them that truly repent.* Beſides, it being impoſſible the Prieſt ſhould know who truly repents, 'tis conſequently impoſſible for him to abſolve in any other Senſe, than declaring,

declaring, that God absolveth all that truly repent. If he absolves in any other Sense, his Absolution can signify nothing but much Confidence or Ignorance. And further, that the words aforesaid [*I absolve thee from all thy Sins*] signify no more than if the Priest had said, I declare thee, if truly penitent, absolv'd, *&c.* plainly appears from the *Collect* immediately following, wherein the Church has order'd the absolving Priest to pray, *Consider his* (the sick Person's) *Contrition——accept his Tears,—impute not to him his former Sins.* All which Petitions were needless, if the Party had been absolutely and certainly absolv'd before; which 'tis plain by this, the Church acknowledges was not done; and that she did not intend any such Absolution should be put into the Mouth of her Ministers, who can have no means to know when they may apply it infallibly: and consequently, as the Bishop has well express'd it, *An infallible Absolution cannot belong to fallible Men.* To this Passage, after some nibbling, Mr. *Sm---th* is pleas'd to say, *pag.* 48. "*If your Lordship* "*means an infallible Absolution cannot come from, or* "*be pronounc'd by Man, I deny it flatly:* But for what Reason does he deny it? why this remarkable one, "*If God vouchsafes to give such a Power* "*to Man, so far as that Power extends, it must be in-*"*fallible.* Wisely said! But does God give such a Power? that is what remains to be prov'd. Can fallible Men, without Inspiration, exercise such a Power? The Apostles indeed might, because our Saviour, *John* 20. 22. inspir'd them for that purpose, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever Sins,* &c. But without such Inspiration, who dares say I absolve, or pardon, with Certainty?

§. 33. What therefore Mr. *Sm---th flatly denies,* viz. *that an infallible Absolution cannot be pronounc'd by fallible Man,* may be readily affirm'd with the greatest Certainty. Indeed he is pleas'd to say, that "*when God Almighty expressly orders a Mini-*"*ster*

"*ster to say, Thy Sins are forgiven, I am as infal-*
"*libly sure they are so, as if I heard a Voice my self*
"*from Heaven.*" All Divines hitherto have taught us, that our Assurance of our Forgiveness depends upon our being conscious, that we have heartily and sincerely repented, and without immediate Revelation we can have none other Assurance. But here's a Gentleman, who is assur'd by the Priest's Assurance, not by his own. If the Priest be assur'd he has power to absolve, then he is sure his Sins are forgiven. I'm afraid that won't follow: for either this Gentleman, when absolv'd by a Priest, is a true Penitent, or he is not; if he be, then his Assurance of Forgiveness comes not from his opinionative Power of the Priest, but from his own Sense, that he is one qualify'd for Pardon by the Terms of the Gospel. But if he be not a true Penitent, then a thousand Priestly Absolutions, be they ever so absolute and peremptory, will do him no Service; and let the Priest be ever so sure of his own Power, he can never assure an impenitent Sinner of Pardon, who understands the Terms of Forgiveness in the Gospel: Upon a sincere Compliance with which Terms we are certainly forgiven by God, and may securely depend upon it, tho all the Priests in *Christendom* should refuse us Absolution, or even anathematize us.

§. 34. 'Tis pleasant to observe how he trifles, *p.* 47. He begins indeed with a seeming serious Air, "*Per-*
"*haps we shall better understand this Controversy, if*
"*we state it in a logical View.*" Then having recited some words of the Bishop, he comes off instantly from his *logical View*, in this abject manner; "*I*
"*leave the Learned to quarrel about Mode and Figure:*"
And well he may; he has some Modesty left to restrain him; if his Stock had been greater, he had not laid down his *Ha——er* to take up the *Pen*, which by no means is the Province of every *Demetrius*. He may repeat his Assertions about God's

God's appointing a Set of Men, as his words are, *pag.* 48, 49. and of his impowering them to act in his ſtead, and urge the Expediency of it as often and as dogmatically as he pleaſes; unleſs he could plainly and clearly ſtate his own Notion of the Prieſtly Powers, or had carefully obſerv'd what the Biſhop has ſaid about Authoritative Abſolution, his intermeddling in this Affair will ſignify nothing, but to amuſe himſelf, and divert the Publick.

§. 35. His Recital of the common Texts that are produc'd in theſe Debates, ſignify nothing from his Pen; becauſe he can neither explain them, nor apply them to his purpoſe. I wiſh he took a little more heed to quote the words right, which he has not done, *Mat.* 18. 18. and to write intelligibly, which he has not done, *pag.* 50. and in ſeveral other Places. And as for Candour, if he knows the true meaning of the Word, he ſeems to have no regard for the thing; why elſe does he upon the leaſt Occaſion, and from no Occaſion given him, divert from honeſt and uſeful Obſervations to invidious Reflections? *pag.* 51. What need was there of his "*modern Notions of Proteſtantiſm, Levities from the* "*Genius of a Mughouſe, or the Pen of a News-Wri-*" *ter*, &c." unleſs it be natural to him to be dull, and to be rude? "O but the Text, *Whoſeſoever Sins* "*ye remit, they are remitted*, &c. *John* 20. 23. *has* "*been deem'd ſo plenary a Proof of ſuch a Power,* "*that it's urg'd by Divines of all ſorts for that pur-*" *poſe.*" Has this Gentleman ſeen, and read, and well conſider'd what has been written by Divines of all Denominations upon theſe Points, that he's ſo poſitive? Have all the Commentators been perus'd by him? He would have his Readers believe this, for he has the Vanity to uſe theſe words; *Divines of all ſorts, and Commentators of all ſorts. Quis expedivit pſittaco ſuum χαῖρε? Quis Demetrium inſtituit, Bibliothecam Vaticanam, & Theologos crepare?*

§. 36.

§. 36. He acknowledges, *p.* 52. which is a Favour, "*That some Powers conferr'd on the Apostles were intirely miraculous, and were not convey'd to their Successors*; *but the Power of remitting and retaining is not so esteem'd*, he says, *by any of the Commentators, but is by them all mention'd as that ordinary and stated Power, which was promis'd to the Church till the end of the World.*" *By any of the Commentators*, and *by all of them*, methinks are Words too great for little *Demetrius*, and too false for a modest Man to use. However they are but Words, and vain ones too out of his Mouth. *Commentators* we know, and *Criticks* we know; but who are *you*, *Sir?* and what is the precise Notion of remitting and retaining you contend for? Dr. *Brett*, in his *Doctrine of Remission explain'd and vindicated*, pag. 51. tells us what he understands by *Absolution*, and the Description is penn'd pretty cautiously, tho (if I rightly understand him) he makes the Remission of Sins to be the Effect of the Priest's Declaration and Pronunciation of it; a Notion, I think, that can never be prov'd: for certainly Pardon of Sins is the pure and sole Effect of the Divine Mercy and Goodness, and the Apostles themselves could be no further concern'd in it, than to declare it, tho they could declare and pronounce it absolutely to such, of whose State they had receiv'd immediate Revelation; that is, they could with Certainty tell such, that God had pardon'd them: but none who are call'd their Successors can declare peremptorily and

---

The Author of the Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church, *speaking of the Absolution in the Primitive Church, says*, pag. 93. That Absolution regarded the Sinner's Conscience, or relax'd the Censures of the Church: The first Absolution was by interceding with God for the Sinner's Forgiveness; the second declar'd him releas'd from the Ecclesiastical Censure. The first kind of Absolution, *says he*, was always in Form of a Prayer throughout the earliest Ages, and continu'd so for a thousand years.

effectually,

effectually, *I pardon you, I abſolve you*, &c. becauſe they have not the ſame meaſure of the Spirit. Nor will or can Remiſſion follow, as an Effect from any Declaration made by any Perſon whatever, it being the certain, proper, and genuine Effect of the Divine Mercy and Goodneſs alone. Men may make known God's Grace and Favour to Penitents; but He alone can originally and authoritatively forgive: for 'tis his Laws and his Authority as a Governor that the Sinner violates, and therefore 'tis he alone that can remit the Puniſhment. All the Power that was certainly convey'd by our Saviour to the Apoſtles, by theſe words, *Whoſeſoever Sins ye remit*, &c. they undoubtedly exercis'd; but the moſt learned Interpreters of any Communion are very cautious in pronouncing, that they have attain'd the adequate and intire Senſe of thoſe Words.

Yet all Interpreters of Note are agreed, that the Apoſtles, in ſome Inſtances of their Power and Authority, had no Succeſſors; and moſt certainly they have none, who can now remit and retain Sins by the ſame Divine Direction as they did. And till Divines can with Certainty, and by infallible Knowledg, diſtinguiſh the Sincere from the Hypocrites, *a peremptory and indicative Abſolution is an Act of the higheſt Preſumption.* And *to think ſuch Abſolution has any Efficacy for the Pardon of Sins*, is, as Dr. *Cannon* * truly ſays, groſs Superſtition. Mr. *Sm—th* thinks a little Gravity, and ſome good Words, will do with his Readers; eſpecially if he can but talk of Commentators, and cite ſome inſufficient Paſſages from two or three of that Number. If he can read the *Critici Sacri*, and underſtand them well, he may ſee Cauſe to alter his Opinion; and for the preſent I will abide by the Senſe of our Church in this matter, where ſhe has expreſs'd her Senſe of

* *Account of two Motions in Convocation*, p. 12.

Abſolution in the plaineſt Terms, *viz. He* (that is, God) *hath given Power and Commandment to his Miniſters to declare and pronounce to his People, being penitent*, &c. And *He*, that is, God *pardoneth*, and not the Prieſt *pardoneth and abſolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his Holy Goſpel.* Upon which it follows, *Wherefore let us beſeech him to grant us true Repentance*, &c. that is, that God may pardon us. By which 'tis evident beyond all diſpute, that in this Abſolution the Miniſter only declares the Terms upon which God will abſolve, *viz.* true Repentance, and an unfeign'd Belief of the Holy Goſpel. And that is indeed all that he has Power to do in the Caſe: unleſs he be a Judge in an Eccleſiaſtical Court, then indeed he has by the *Canons* a Power, *Solvere nexus ſive vincula Juris*, i. e. to abſolve one from the Cenſures or Sentence of the Court.

§. 37. Mr. *S---th* proceeds to cite an Excellent Paſſage out of the *Preſervative, pag.* 93, 94. which if his Readers look into, they muſt bluſh for the Confidence of this weak Man, who has firſt left the word [ſuch] out of the laſt Clauſe in the Paragraph, and ſo made the words Run, "*Therefore it* "*can't be the true Intent of this Paſſage*, [*John* 20. 21, "22, 23.] *to give any Power to Men*"; whereas the Biſhop's Words are——*any ſuch Power to Men:* Pointing by that word [*ſuch*] to a Power to abſolve, ſuppos'd to be lodg'd in Prieſts (which he had ſpoken of a few Lines before) without which God wou'd not pardon Sinners. I leave the Readers to judge whether ſuch a notorious Perverſion was an effect of Mr. *Sm---th*'s Care or his Candor.

§. 38. I don't ſee how he cou'd read and cite the next Paragraph out of the 94th *Page* of the *Preſervative*, without being rightly inform'd how far any one beſides the Supreme Being, is concern'd in Abſolution, *&c.* But he goes on with Miſtake upon Miſtake, and with one Perverſion after another; that

that to trace 'em wou'd be endleſs trifling. For he neither underſtands the Biſhop nor himſelf; nor can be well underſtood in many places by his Readers. Yet, thus much is very plain, that he knows very little of this Controverſy. Wou'd any Man, who is in his right Mind, affirm, as Mr. *Sm---th* does, *pag.* 57. " *That God wou'd moſt certainly pardon* " *ſuch as were orally pronounc'd abſolv'd by a Regular* " *Prieſt, by virtue of his Miſſion?* " Can any thing be more Stupid or Popiſh than that Aſſertion? Yet he asks, " *If the Miniſters of God had not ever ſuch a* " *Power?* And poſitively ſays, *That God ratifies and* " *confirms in Heaven, what they* (that is his Prieſts) " *do of this kind on Earth.*" Which Notion is directly contrary to Scripture and Reaſon. The Scriptures teach expreſly, *That God only can forgive Sin.* We are alſo taught in the Lord's Prayer, and in very many places of *our Common Prayer*, to ask forgiveneſs of God alone. Had a Prieſt ſuch a Power delegated to him, it wou'd be a proper and a reaſonable Act to beg forgiveneſs of the Prieſt; and if he orally pronounc'd Abſolution, God wou'd be oblig'd, according to Mr. *Sm---th*, to ratify the Act of his *own Commiſſioner.* But 'tis impoſſible for any Biſhop or Prieſt in the whole Chriſtian Church to ſhew a Commiſſion from the Holy Scriptures (they may from the Pope, I grant) to pardon and abſolve this or that individual Perſon, otherwiſe than conditionally; or in any other Senſe than this: *If you truly and ſincerely Repent*, &c. *I do aſſure you from the Word of God that he pardons and abſolves you; for he has requir'd us Miniſters to declare his Pardon to true Penitents* *. 'Tis very obſervable, and deſerves to be

* *And the Fathers teach the ſame very fully, which Mr.* Sm—th *may read in* the Penitential Diſcipline of the Primitive Church, *Publiſh'd* 1714. pag. 95, 96, 97. *Ibid.* The Prieſts only intercede with God, and pray to God for the Sinner: *But* 'tis

be often and well consider'd by *Priests* and *People*, that our Blessed Saviour pronounces his Absolution in this humble manner in three Evangelists, *Thy Sins are forgiven thee.* But some of his Ministers and Messengers have learn'd to speak in the peremptory Form, *I absolve thee from all thy Sins*; putting (as it were) themselves in God's stead with the highest Arrogance.

This indicative, peremptory, and presumptuous Form of Absolution is modern, as may be seen in Dr. *Cannon*'s *Account of two Motions in Convocation* 1712. and more at large in a Book, entitled, *The Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church*, &c. *printed* 1714 *. If any Priest has receiv'd a special Revelation from God of the State of a Person, and of God's gracious Intention towards that Person, then let him declare the Person absolv'd with as much Assurance, as he will: But even then, in such a case, the Priest can only declare to that Penitent what he certainly knows in the form our blessed Saviour us'd, *Thy Sins are forgiven thee*, or to that effect. But without such Revelation he cannot possibly take upon him to declare, in the Name of God, this or that particular Person to be forgiven; because he dares not declare what he is not sure of: and without Revelation every Priest is, and must be uncertain, both as to the Will of God, and the State of particular Persons. In the present State of the Christian Church then, our Divines having no immediate Revelation from God of his special Grace to this or that Person, nor of the State of particular Persons; they can only declare in general,

---

certain, *says the Author*, God only doth pardon; *for which he produces express Authorities from St.* Ambrose, Clem. Alexandrinus, *St.* Basil, *St.* Cyprian, *and* Aquinas.

* *Where the Author says, this direct and peremptory Form was ordered to be us'd by Cardinal* Othobon, &c. 1268. Vide Plura, p. 93, 98, ——200——209, 211, 212, 213. & Appendice.

that

that *God pardons and abſolves all them that truly Repent*, &c. as our Church ſpeaks: or, which is the ſame in other words; If you truly and ſincerely Repent, I declare that God has forgiven your Sins. 'Tis a plain caſe; let any ſober and wiſe Man conſider it ſeriouſly, and he will find the Authority of the Prieſt neither doth, nor can reach any further. In this view of the point, Mr. *Sm--th* may rectify his Notion, without my laying open any more of his Miſtakes; which wou'd be troubleſome, and of no uſe to him or my Readers. What God authorizes Men to do, he certainly enables them to do. He authoriz'd (*John* 20. 22, 23.) and enabled the Apoſtles *to Remit and Retain Sins*; i. e. according to the beſt Interpreters, to declare ſuch pardon'd, whom they knew by his Spirit he had pardon'd; and to undertake to heal ſuch miraculouſly, whom they knew God intended to heal, *&c.* This was what God authoriz'd the Apoſtles to do. But he has not, nor the *Apoſtles* have not authoriz'd any Perſons to do the like in this Age, becauſe he has not enabled 'em by an infallible Knowledge of the caſe of *Individuals*, nor of his Will concerning them. Nor does God by that Text promiſe, nor indeed by any other, that *ſuch miraculous Remiſſion as attended the Apoſtles*, ſhou'd deſcend in a regular Succeſſion: Remiſſion, now, is no more than a general Declaration, and an Aſſurance to the Penitent by the Prieſt from the Word of God, that their Sins are forgiven. This is all that can be made of it, if Men ſhould write on to the World's end; and truly is what every one has cauſe to be greatly thankful for to the Divine Goodneſs. To declare Remiſſion, or to abſolve in this Senſe, every Prieſt has a Divine Authority, or Commiſſion, as (ſome word it) and beyond this he has none, and can have none from the *Goſpel*; tho' he may have pretended Authority, and a plenary Commiſſion from the *Roman Pontif*, as Father

Tekel

Tekel had at the beginning of the *Reformation*. But the times of ſuch groſs Ignorance and Superſtition are, I hope, at an end in *Britain*. And tho * two or three Learned Divines have of late unwarily expreſs'd themſelves in this matter in a Controverſy that was reviv'd, and not throughly ſtudied of late; yet I dare ſay they have a horrour for every thing in *Popery*: and tho I am utterly a Stranger to thoſe learned Gentlemen, yet I believe 'em to be Perſons of that Ability and Integrity, that I can almoſt aſſure my ſelf, they by this time have better conſider'd this point, which is ſo well explain'd, and ſet in ſo true and clear a Light by the Biſhop's *Preſervative*, that I wou'd hope even Mr. *Sm---th* himſelf, diveſted of his warm Prejudices, might upon a cool Review ſee cauſe to amend his Notions; which I heartily wiſh he may, becauſe his Diligence is commendable: which when accompanied with more Judgment and Modeſty, will hereafter make his Reading more uſeful to himſelf, and his Writing leſs troubleſome to the World.

§. 39. If Mr. *Sm--th* had been careful and attentive, would he in this Controverſy have cited two large Paſſages from Dr. *Cave*'s *Primitive Chriſtianity* concerning *Church-Cenſures*, which are ſo wide from the Point the Biſhop diſcourſes upon? Nothing but very great Inadvertency can excuſe ſo *aliene, ſo impertinent a Citation*. No body doubts, whether the Church has power to excommunicate Offenders, and receive Penitents; or whether ſhe can relax, abate, or entirely remit her *own Cenſures*. But the Point the Biſhop is upon, is to ſhew that no Man has Authority from God to remit or retain Sins in God's ſtead; or to declare Remiſſion to particular Men, without ſpecial Revelation. All therefore that Dr. *Cave* ſays in Mr. *Sm---th*'s Citations, may be, and is readily granted. And ſo might good

* Dr. Brett. *Mr. Archdeacon* Hill.

part

part of what follows, at another time and upon another occaſion, ſeparate from the many Miſtakes and undutiful Inſinuations ſcatter'd up and down in every Page; which are the more culpable in Mr. *Sm—th*, becauſe of his many and ſolemn Expreſſions of the greateſt Veneration for the Miniſters of God: amongſt whom he muſt, upon his own Principles, acknowledge the *Biſhop of Bangor* to be in the firſt Rank.

§. 40. What Opinion Mr. *Sm--th* has of himſelf and his Readers, is very plain. I who have been one of 'em, pity him, and wiſh him more Wiſdom and Modeſty. If the moſt candid Reader were to caſt his Eye firſt upon the bottom of his 74th Page, and find him ſumming up his Diſcourſe in one general view, thus; "*Whether we conſider the expreſs Deciſions of Scripture*, "*the Senſe of the Fathers, of all Commentators, the* "*publick and moſt authentick Voice of the Church, the* "*Perplexity and Uncertainty of the Biſhop.* *" I ſay, whoever ſhou'd read this Paſſage firſt, wou'd certainly expect to find Texts learnedly handled; the Fathers copiouſly cited; all the Commentors produced, and the Senſe of the Church fully and clearly ſtated; and, in fine, the Biſhop's Arguments entirely refuted. *At, quid ferat hic tanto dignum promiſſor hiatu?* He jingles with the Texts, as a Morice-Dancer does with his Bells. He mangles three *Engliſh* Commentators, and ſlights all the reſt, *pag.* 53. He cites none of the Fathers, but one Father *Cave*, who dy'd about half a Score Years ago; and him quite beſides his purpoſe. For the Senſe of the Church, he only names a line or two from the Liturgy. And for the Biſhop's Words and Arguments, Mr. *Sm—th*, in almoſt every Page, miſtakes and perverts 'em, yet in ſo weak, and often in ſo ridiculous a manner, that

* *This Learned Gentleman has forgot to cite the Councils; but in the next Edition we ſhall have large Authorities from them.*

his

his Friends bluſh, and his Adverſaries ſmile, not without a juſt Contempt. He pretends, *pag.* 76. a mighty Veneration for the Gown; yet neither the Habit nor the Order, neither the Learning nor the real Services done for our Church and Nation by the Biſhop of *Bangor*, do ſecure him from Mr. *Sm——th*'s ignorant and impertinent Remarks. So that 'tis manifeſt his Reſpect is confin'd to his Favourites, the reſt have an indefeaſible Right to his Hatred. Why elſe ſo much freedom with the Biſhop, the moſt inoffenſive Man in his Life and Writings? I'll refer Mr. *Sm---th* himſelf to the foot of his 80th and 81ſt *pages* for an inſtance, but not of his Good Manners, or his Underſtanding; and to the 79th *page* for his impartial Treatment of the Biſhop and Mr. *Sm---th*'s own Readers; who are egregiouſly abus'd by his Miſrepreſentations, as if the Biſhop aſſerted that *Clergymen might be totally depriv'd of their Holy Orders by the Civil Powers, and made a jeſt of Sacerdotal Bleſſings and Curſes*, pag. 81. All Mr. *Sm--th*'s Profeſſion, tho ever ſo ſolemn, of being unbyaſs'd and without perſonal or Party-Regards, and the ſorry Excuſe he attempts to make for his warmth in the ſame Page, are of the ſame piece with the Pamphlet, wonderfully modeſt and candid. What he preſents his Readers with, flows, as he tells 'em, from the ſincere *Dictates of his Conſcience*; which upon my word is a melancholy account of the State of Mr. *Sm---th*'s Mind, and deſerves our Pity, and his further Conſideration.

§. 41. As for *Party-Words* (againſt which he declares) they are wicked in their Deſign and their Conſequences; diſtracting the People, and dividing the Nation. But (begging his pardon) *King* George *for ever*, is not and cannot be a Party-word; for 'tis the Senſe of *Whig and Tory Parliaments* in their *Votes*, their *Acts*, their *Oaths* for many Years, *which makes it the Senſe of the Nation*, and not of a Party, as this Gentleman would boldly inſinuate. Tho' *High Church*,

Church, &c. is a ſcandalous Party-Word affected by *Mobs*, and others who by their *Rank* or their *Function* ſhou'd know better, who violate all Oaths, and the moſt Sacred Bonds of Charity, *&c.* and ſeem to contemn and deteſt the Name of Proteſtant; becauſe thoſe who are fond of that Name differ in ſome leſſer Matters, who nevertheleſs agree in the weightier Matters of the Chriſtian Law. The Papiſts might, methinks, teach this Gentleman, and others too a little Temper and Prudence; for they ſtyle *Franciſcans* and *Dominicans*, *Janſeniſts* and *Moliniſts*, &c. all *Catholicks*, tho pretty widely differing, and warmly oppoſing each other. Whereas this Gentleman is ſo offended at the calling ſome *our Proteſtant Brethren*, who hold the great Fundamental of the Chriſtian Religion, *viz. That the Scriptures are the only Rule of Faith and Life*; that he forgets his Grammar, and can hardly be ſaid to ſpeak Senſe, *pag.* 83, 84. However, he hopes to recompenſe his Readers by his Zeal, which is as blind as his worſt Enemies cou'd wiſh it. 'Twill be ſome excuſe for him, if it be as honeſt as 'tis blind: tho that may be juſtly queſtion'd by ſeveral Paſſages. But for that let him ſtand or fall, not by his own Conſcience, for that mayn't do its Office, but at a juſter Tribunal, where he will find Abſolution and Malediction too, impartially pronounc'd, not according to *Parties* in the *State*, or *Sects* and *Communions* in the Church; not according to the vain Opinions of *Orthodoxy* or *Heterodoxy*, Aſſent to or Diſſent from *Human Eſtabliſhments*; but according to the Piety and Sincerity of our Hearts, and the Simplicity and Integrity of our Lives.

Sovereign Princes will not be exempt from this Tryal, however privileg'd by their Characters here on Earth. Then the true Cauſe of the *Popery of King* Charles *and* James *the Second* will be certainly known, which Mr. *Sm--th* and others (always in a Paſſion) aſcribe to their *Exile*, and that *Exile* to the *Civil*

War in the laſt Century; but tho this may be true, 'tis but part of the Truth: For the *Civil War* is by my Lord *Clarendon* himſelf plainly intimated to have taken its Riſe from the *Popiſh and violent Counſels*, and ill Conduct of the *Court*; and the *Popery of the two Royal Brothers muſt firſt be charg'd upon a private Education* in the *Romiſh Religion*, during the firſt thirteen Years of their Youth, according to thoſe *famous* Articles of Marriage between *Charles* I. and the Princeſs *Henrietta* of *France*. And the indefatigable Zeal of his Popiſh Queen and her Romiſh Prieſts loſt no time, and ſpar'd no pains, without queſtion, to ſecure the young Princes in a Popiſh Intereſt; for which the Nation has ſmarted above fifty Years, and is like to do ſo for fifty Years to come, becauſe ſome wicked Men make it their buſineſs to diſguiſe and miſrepreſent Perſons and Things; being always ſure of numbers of weak and credulous Men, upon whom they may impoſe the fooliſheſt and the falſeſt things in the World, under the ſpecious Names of *Church* and *Monarchy*. From our cunning *Trickſters* in Church and State, Mr. *Sm--th* has unhappily receiv'd ſome Impreſſions, which riper Years and better Conſideration may hereafter rectify; a Happineſs I heartily wiſh him, and for which I ſhou'd with great pleaſure congratulate him.

§. 42. My Lord, A third Hand lifted up againſt the Biſhop is a Gentleman, who tells us he has publiſh'd *Elements of Policy Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, in a Mathematical Method*. From ſuch a Hand ſomething conſiderable might have been expected; but ſo it is, that the *Preſervative*, tho it ſelf one of the exacteſt Pieces on the Subject that yet has ſeen the light, has met with the dulleſt and rudeſt Anſwers. Mr. *M. E.* takes upon him to vindicate the *Old Engliſh Conſtitution*, but then 'tis an *Engliſh Conſtitution* before there were either *Commons or Lords*, which he ſuppoſes had not, *ab Origine*, any ſhare in the *Legiſlature*, and obtain'd

obtain'd it at laſt by Royal Grace and Favour. This is what *Filmer*, and ſome other obſcure Names were driving at in the Reign of *Charles* II.

§. 43. Mr. *Petyt*, and ſince him Mr. *Tyrrel*, have ſaid enough to ſatisfy any judicious unprejudic'd Reader of the *Antiquity of the Houſe of Commons*, &c. But this *Vindicator of our Old* Engliſh *Conſtitution* is a profeſs'd Enemy to *Parliaments*, and ſo are his *Party*; feign wou'd they extinguiſh that glorious *Aſſembly*, in which all our Relief and Security lies. They are for, not the preſent *Conſtitution of King, Lords and Commons*, tho that has been the Conſtitution above 450 Years, as is granted by theſe very *Anti-Parliamentarians*; but they are for a Prince governing by Abſolute Power, without the Reſtraint of Laws or *Parliaments*, which is ſuch an *Old* Engliſh *Conſtitution* as was never *in Rerum Naturâ*.

§. 44. I don't find the *Commons* deſcended to take notice of that falſe and inſolent Aſſertion of *Filmer*'s, much leſs do I think this *Trifler Mr.* E. will be regarded by our preſent *Houſe of Commons* ——*Aquila non capit Muſcas.*——They have greater Affairs to mind, yet it mayn't be amiſs for ſome private Hand to inſtruct and chaſtiſe this bold Pretender to Antiquity and Argument.

In his Preface, *pag.* 1. he ſays, "*A Stranger* to the "Controverſy wou'd imagine that *Parliaments were* "*as Antient at leaſt as the Flood, and that a Houſe of* "*Commons was preſerv'd in* Noah's *Ark.*"

Let me tell him, as much as he intends this for elegant Banter, I can aſſure him 'tis Truth to a tittle. I ſuppoſe it will be granted in this, as well as in all other Caſes, *De Nomine Contentio eſt Supervacua, cum de Re ipsâ conſtiterit.* No body thinks the Word Parliament to be above 7 or * 800 Years old; but Aſſemblies of the People, or their Chiefs and Re-

* *Lord* Coke's *Inſtit.* p. 1. §. 164.

preſentatives in all Nations upon Emergent Publick Occaſions, to conſult and determine of their own Affairs, has been a practice ſo univerſal as to Time and Place, where not hinder'd by Tyrannick, Military and Deſpotick Princes, that all the Hiſtories of Nations now extant afford plain footſteps in this matter; which a prejudic'd Man may ſlight, but cannot fairly deny.

§. 45. The Style and Title of ſuch *Aſſemblies* may indeed change with Language, which is a thing continually changing; and the Names or Deſignations of the *Conſtituents* may alter; as is apparent in the preſent caſe: but it has ever been the immutable and conſtant Practice of *Civiliz'd and Well-govern'd Nations* to meet in *General Aſſemblies*, to adviſe, debate, and finally determine concerning their *Publick National Concerns.*

§. 46. That this was our Caſe in *Britain* before *Chriſt's* time, is clear from *Jul. Cæſar*'s Account. *Com. l.* 5. where he ſays, "*Summa Imperii bellique adminiſtrandi Communi Concilio permiſſa eſt Caſſivelano.*" * And the ſame appears to have been the Caſe in *Gaul*, l. 7. *Commentar.* "*Re in Controverſiam deductâ, Totius Gallia Concilium Bibracte indicitur; eodem conveniunt undique frequentes multitudines. Suffragiis res permittitur, ad unum omnes Vercingentorigem proclamant Imperatorem*——" And *Tacitus* in his *Germania* gives the like account of that Country in theſe Words "——*De minoribus Rebus Principes conſultant, de majoribus Omnes.*" To deſcend lower, wou'd exceed the bounds of this Paper; and the Subject has been unanſwerably manag'd by Mr. *Petyt* in his *Antiquity and Power*, &c. *of the Houſe of Commons*; and by Mr. *Tyrrel* in his *Bibliotheca Politica*, and his learned Preface to his *Hiſtory of* England, which no Writer of Note has hitherto undertaken to confute; and

* *The Mirrour of Juſtice cited* ut ſupra *by Lord* Coke, *mentions an Aſſembly of the Counties*, &c. *in King* Alfred's *Reign.*

laſt

laſt of all by Mr. *Rymer*, whoſe *Fœdera* Mr. *E.* has cited ſo often.

§. 47. To the *Lords* Mr. *E.* is pleas'd to allow a greater Antiquity, which is ſo notorious an Error, in point of fact, that one wou'd wonder how a Perſon who has dipp'd into Hiſtory with Judgment cou'd aſſert it. He might from *Selden*, and our *Chronicles*, have obſerv'd, that the Diſtinctions of *Peerage* now in Uſe are not of that great Antiquity; but National Aſſemblies have been always in Uſe.

§. 48. *'Tis the Unhappineſs of Mankind*, Mr. *E.* tells us, Pref. p. 5. "*That ſince the Creation they have been* "*led into Error, by not ſetting a right Signification upon* "*Words.*" Which Obſervation is moſt true in the Caſe before us: becauſe *Superficial Examiners* don't in their reading the Antients meet with Modern Words and Phraſes, 'tis preſently concluded, that the things intended by thoſe Words, were not in Being or Practice in former Ages.

§. 49. It wou'd be endleſs to copy and anſwer the many Miſtakes and bold Reflections of Mr. *E.* throughout his Book. The whole is a Miſcellaneous Libel againſt our Conſtitution, without Method or Diſcretion; and the Author wou'd deſerve one's pity, if his Confidence and Bigotry did not make him unworthy of it. He is not content our Kings ſhould be only a Branch of the Supreme Power, which yet was as much as King *Charles* I. inſiſted upon, in his Anſwer to the *Commons* about *Hull*; and in his *Anſwer to the nineteen Propoſitions*, * "*Knowing* "*very well*, ſays that King, *the great and unlimited* "*Power of Parliaments.*" But Mr. *E.* Pref. *p. 6.* is for placing the Supreme Power in the King alone, contrary to the Opinion of that King, and of all our Kings for many Ages, who have acted *with Lords and Commons* as Co-efficients in the Legiſlative Ca-

* *Lord* Clarendon, *B.* 5. *p.* 511. *&* 538. *&* 647. *Oct. Edit.*

pacity;

pacity; and the Power of Parliaments has been exercis'd without Oppoſition from the Throne, and never was call'd in queſtion by our Princes, tho of late attack'd with the greateſt Inſolence by ſome *Semi-Antiquarians*, &c.

§. 50. Mr. *E.* Pref. *p.* 5. tells us *King* William I. *made the Kingdom a perfect Property*, &c. 'Tis true, his Reign was full of Violence and Tyranny, of which he repented; but ſure this *Writer* wou'd not have us think his Violations of Law and Property were *de Jure Regio*. As for his Notion, *pag.* 11. that the Kings of *England* formerly held all the Lands of *England* in their own Property, 'tis altogether founded on a miſtake, and is never aſſerted by our *Lawyers* in the Senſe Mr. *E.* wou'd inſinuate. *Fines*, *Forfeitures* and *Eſcheats*, or *Devolutions* of Eſtates having no private Heirs, are by our Antient Laws annex'd to the Crown for Publick Uſes, and the Support of the Government, and ſo become the Property of the *Prince*, as he is the *Repreſentative* of the *Nation*. *Dominia Rerum Singularum ex Jure Gentium deſcendunt, quod a Principibus non poteſt tolli——Reges Supremam Poteſtatem & Juriſdictionem, Dominia vero Rerum ſingularum ad ſubditos ſpectant. Bene Seneca ſeptimo de Benefic. Omnia Rex imperio poſſidet, ſinguli Dominio; ad Imperatores poteſtas omnium pertinet ad ſingulos, proprietas.*" *Dr. Duck, de Author. Jur. Civil. l.* 2. c. 1. Which Authorities are ſo true in *Britain*, that by *Magna Charta*, and our conſtant Uſage for many Ages, the King here cannot take as his Right one Shilling in the Pound of the Rents of the Nation, but as a Free Gift of the Subject in Parliament.

§. 51. Mr. *E.* is mightily pleas'd with a Queſtion he puts, Pref. *pag.* 6. "*If*, ſays he, *the King is only a Branch of the Supreme Power —— are the Lords and Commons the other Branches? If ſo, let any Man ſhew me the Supreme Power after the Diſſolution of the Houſes.*" *Anſwer.* Let him ſhew it us then in the King

King—The King in *Parliament* acts in his *Legiſlative Capacity*, i. e. *his Supreme Power* in conjunction with the *Parliament*, out of *Parliament* he acts only in his *Executive Capacity*. Yet his, and his *Parliament's Legiſlative Power* is not extinguiſh'd, becauſe it ceaſes to act for a time; but ſubſiſts really, virtually, and potentially in the King, Lords and Commons of *Great Britain*.

§. 52. 'Tis ſtrange to obſerve how carefully Mr. *E.* defines Hereditary Right, Pref. *pag.* 12. and affirms hereupon, as all his Friends did, that King *James* II. was *Hæres Inteſtatus* to *Charles* II. and had an Indiſputable Right. Yet, *pag.* 14. Mr. *E.* aſſerts expreſly, *that the Property of the Crown is ſolely in our Kings, and they may appoint whom they pleaſe their Heirs.* What can be more Inconſiſtent? King *James* II. had a Right, which, in the Opinion of the old Tories, no Power on Earth cou'd ſet aſide; and yet *Charles* II. might: for Mr. *E.* ſays, our Kings may appoint whom they wou'd their Heirs.

§. 53. Some late Writers, indeed, have ſuppos'd a Power in our Princes to diſpoſe of the Crown by Will, but 'tis a ſtrange Power that was never claim'd or exercis'd without Conſent of Parliament: yet Mr. *E.* infers our Kings have ſuch a Right to diſpoſe of the Crown, from a ſhort *Record* out of *Rymer's Fœdera*, wherein King *Stephen*, by a writing under his own Hand, *appointed* Henry II. *his Succeſſor and Heir after him*, &c. and this ſays Mr. *E. King* Stephen *did without the Intervention of Parliament.* Very well. I doubt this *Record* will prove too weak a ſupport for Mr. *E*'s Notions, if it be rightly conſider'd. It's plain King *Stephen* was not the Regular Poſſeſſor of the Crown, but *Henry* whom he appointed to ſucceed him: now can any thing be more abſurd, than to ſuppoſe *Stephen* had a *right to diſpoſe of the Crown*; who, as an *Uſurper*, had *no Right* to the *Crown?* As for *Henry*, he needed not the Authority of *Parliament* to ſupport his Claim;

all

all he needed was a Declaration of *Stephen*'s, that *Henry* was the next Heir. King *Stephen*, indeed uſes theſe Words, *Conſtitui, & Ei, & Hæredibus ſuis Regnum Angliæ confirmavi*, to gratify his own Pride; but *Henry* look'd upon 'em as giving him no Title: that Title he did (and I dare ſay Mr. *E.* will) found upon his Deſcent from *Henry* I. Here's a *Record* then, produc'd by Mr. *E.* to ſhew the ſole Property of the Kingdom was in our Kings, becauſe an Uſurper tells the Legal Heir that he ſhall ſucceed him. *Riſum teneatis*——Wou'd our Jacobites have acquieſc'd, if Queen *Anne* had under hand, or by her Will, without the concurrence of *Parliament*, confirm'd the Succeſſion to the Princeſs *Sophia*, (as ſhe did by many Acts and Deeds in and out of *Parliament*) in the ſame Words as King *Stephen* did? Yet the Property of the Kingdom being ſolely in our Kings, as Mr. *E.* holds, the Queen might, according to Mr. *E*'s Notion, Pref. *pag.* 14. *appoint whom ſhe pleas'd Heir thereto.* This, I confeſs, might be us'd as a new Argument for his Majeſty not thought on hitherto by his Friends; but, I thank God, he does not ſtand in need of ſuch *broken Reeds.*

§. 54. This Mr. *E.* is not very lucky in meddling with Records; for to "*ſhew the Legiſlative Power* "*of the Lords and Commons not to be ſo Antient as ſome* "*pretend*, &c." he mentions a *Letter of* Henry II. *quitting his Claim to Wrecks*, &c. If the King had a juſt Claim to ſuch Wrecks by the Common Law, who doubts but he might quit and renounce it without a Parliament? If our Kings make Grants of Lands or Privileges to a Subject out of Parliament, which is common in every Reign; muſt it preſently be ſuppos'd they held no *Parliaments?*

§. 55. Another proof out of Mr. *Rymer*'s *Fœdera*, which indeed is no proof, yet offer'd by Mr. *E.* to maintain his Notion, that our *Kings* have ſolely without *Lords or Commons* exercis'd a Legiſlative Power; is *an Ordinance*, as he calls it, of *Richard* I. con-

concerning *Pilgrims*, &c. ſurely Mr. *E.* did not heed the Stile of it. Had he minded thoſe Words *de Communi Proborum Virorum Conſilio*, and read Mr. *Tyrrel*'s *Bibliotheca*, he wou'd have dropt this Record, as being clearly againſt his Aſſertion; but a warm Head can fetch Concluſions from any Premiſes. King *Richard*'s Exactions upon the *Clergy*, and others, ſhall be an Argument of Right, *pag.* 17. which Mr. *E.* himſelf in the very next Page ſhews, by a Statute of King *Richard*, "was a *Wrong* that he "promis'd *neither he nor his Succeſſors ſhou'd put in* "*practice again, upon any pretence whatſoever*; *but that* "*all the Liberties of the Church ſhou'd be inviolably* "*preſerv'd.*" Plainly implying that thoſe Liberties had been violated by King *Richard*.

§. 56. From the word *Clergy*, Mr. *E.* takes occaſion to *ſtart a new game*, pag. 18, 19. *ſhewing what humble Application was made by our Princes formerly to the Monks and Secular Clergy*; *and that King* John *did not ſo much as pretend to write to the Biſhops of his time in a Mandatory Stile——but deſir'd them to intercede with the Pope in his behalf.* Bleſſed Times indeed! What wou'd Mr. *E.* be at? From *Facts* of *Violence and Arrogance* infer the *Rights* of *Princes* and *Clergy*? Wou'd he have theſe things reviv'd? Are the Violences of ſome of our Kings, and the Arrogance of the Popiſh Clergy in former Ages, the *Old Conſtitution* he likes and vindicates? 'Tis plain our *Nonjurors* are hard ſet, when they are forc'd to defend their Cauſe by the Facts of a Popiſh Clergy, and Tyrannical Princes. Mr. *E.* ſhou'd not have forgot the Story of *Thomas Becket* and the *Whipping Monks* of *Canterbury*, to ſhew the Rights of the Clergy in *Henry* II's Reign; but the Gentleman tells us, *pag.* 20. *'Tis time to draw in his Reins, Paſſion indulg'd may ſpeak extravagant Truths*——His Inſinuation of Severity is monſtrous Falſhood and Ingratitude, when thouſands of the late Rebels are alive and in good heart, ready for a new Trial of Skill at *Dumblain*,

if their *Foreign Helps* don't fail 'em: Which hitherto, thanks to a kind Providence, have done us no hurt, but have done the *Nonjurors* this real Service, *viz.* to put them upon ſeriouſly conſidering with themſelves, *What they have been doing! What Cauſe they have been writing and fighting for! What Plots they have form'd againſt our Religion and Country! What Innocent Blood they have ſpilt, and wou'd ſtill be glad to ſpill! How much Blood and Treaſure their wicked Notions have coſt this Nation! How much they have encourag'd Popery! How many of their Friends are apoſtatiz'd to Popery! What Ruin their Notions have caus'd, and what Calamities and Univerſal Deſolation muſt follow, if their Immoral and Impious Prayers were heard!* Theſe will be proper Subjects for Meditation, after Mr. *E.* has impartially review'd his own Papers, and the *Preſervative*, without Prejudice. We are not ſtartled with his Confidence, nor baffled with empty Sounds: His Miſtakes are palpable, and ſo are his Hatred and Animoſity.

§. 57. We can read the Recognition *Primo Jacobi*, (which Mr. *E.* recites) without fear for our Cauſe; * tho the *Nonjurors* cannot examine our Hiſtories, or our Laws, without bluſhing: For they wou'd find our wiſe Anceſtors (from *Fergus* I. to *Kenneth* III. which was 1300 Years) diſpos'd of the Succeſſion to the fitteſt of the *Royal Line*, without regard to a *direct Deſcent*. They wou'd find *John Baliol*, the Ninety ſixth King of *Scotland*, and *his Poſterity excluded*, and the Crown ſettled upon *Robert Bruce* and *his Poſterity*: They wou'd find, of that very *Robert Bruce*'s Deſcendants by a Female, thirteen of the *Stuarts* have reign'd in *Scotland*, whoſe Original Title was founded upon Acts of *Ex-*

* *No body can reaſonably doubt, but the ordinary Courſe of Succeſſion ſhould always take place, when 'tis for the Publick Good; and 'tis as reaſonable it ſhou'd always give place, when that is neceſſary for the Publick Safety.*

cluſion

cluſion and Settlement. And yet what a *Din* is made by this *Gentleman*, and others, for a *Pretender*, who if he were really the Son of King *James*, muſt not, cannot deny, nor all his Friends for him, that the *Brunſwick Stuart*, now on the Throne, has juſt the ſame Title, as the thirteen *Bruce Stuarts* who laſt poſſeſs'd it: but with this great Advantage, that *this Proteſtant Stuart* is moſt capable and qualify'd to *govern, that is, to execute all our Proteſtant Laws and Statutes in Defence of our Proteſtant Religion and Liberties*; but a Popiſh *Stuart* is not, and cannot be, whilſt a Papiſt.

§. 58. Let Mr. *E.* remove this Difficulty, and that will do more Service to his Cauſe than one hundred of his Tracts in the Mathematical way; which no body yet has been idle enough to anſwer, and therefore 'tis not anſwer'd: and he may depend upon it, no body will return him a particular Anſwer to all his Miſtakes in his *Old* Engliſh *Conſtitution*. It wou'd, indeed, be tranſcribing moſt of the Book, when to read it only is a Task ungrateful to ſuch who can better employ their time.

§. 59. Mr. *E.* begins his Diſcourſe with an Account of his former Performance, and ſome new Remarks which are far from being clear or methodical: 'Tis a *Farrago* of ſeveral things that may, and may not be granted; for which few will thank him, becauſe few will underſtand him. Had this Gentleman read without byaſs *the Judicious Mr.* Hooker, Grotius *and* Puffendorf, or Mr. *Lock* of Government, and conſider'd 'em impartially; all his Pains had been ſav'd, and his unhappy Prejudices avoided, which have tainted his Charity to that degree, that he is not afraid, *pag.* 11. to affix the moſt extravagant Imputation upon a whole Body, who ſcorn however to retaliate, and wiſh him a better Spirit. Some Mens Wit and Writings do moſt hurt to themſelves, which I believe will be the Fate of Mr. *E.* I cannot but pity him much, when I conſider what

a *Labyrinth* the whole Diſcourſe is. However, there is ſuch an Appearance * of Sincerity in this Gentleman, that I can freely allow him no ſmall ſhare in my Charity, as I dare ſay the Biſhop of *Bangor* does, notwithſtanding his ill Treatment.

§. 60. Mr. *E. pag.* 26, 27. gives us his Senſe of *Rom.* 13. and ſays, "*The Interpretation of theſe* "*Words* [*the Powers that be*] *by ſome is Ridiculous*; "*for they wou'd perſuade the World, that the Pre-* "*cept extends to give a Sanction to any Uſurping Powers* "*in their own Times.*" Thoſe whom Mr. *E.* calls *Whigs* have ſaid, and will ſay that ſuch an Interpretation is *Impious*, for 'tis to make God the Author of Evil. Yet this very Gentleman a few Lines after ſays, "*That no Power can be conſtituted but by God*; "*and by ſuch Authority the* Roman *Emperors reign'd:*" Whom all Hiſtories condemn for the *greateſt Uſurpers*, *Tyrants*, and *Enemies* to Authority, or Juſt Civil Power, that ever liv'd. And thus Mr. *E.* has extended the Words to give a Sanction, as he ſpeaks, to Uſurping Powers, *&c.* And 'tis to the ſame purpoſe this Text is generally apply'd by the *Jacobite Writers*, who make Tyrants the Ordinance of God, and ſay they are not to be reſiſted. This Abſurdity is in Words diſclaim'd by Mr. *E.* I wiſh he and his Friends did not run into it in certain Caſes. Thoſe he calls *Whigs*, will to a Man reject with Abhorrence the thought of a *Divine Right* either in *Uſurpers* or *Tyrants*. Civil Power or Authority, truly ſo call'd, is always to be ſubmitted to; but Tyranny and Uſurpation are to be borne by Nations, till fairly redreſs'd in a juſt and reaſonable, and if it may be, in a National way.

---

* *This was written before I ſaw his Serious Admonition to the Reverend* Dr. Kennet, *in which there are ſo many abſurd, inſolent, and unchriſtian things; that it has much abated the Compaſſion I had for the Author, who ſeems to have renounc'd the common Rules of Charity and Good Manners.*

§. 61. Mr. *E.* is mightily againſt Providential Kings, *p.* 29. "*Providential Plagues and Famines he* "*thinks may be as well pleaded for, as Providential Uſur-* "*pers.*" Without doubt *Tyrants* and *Uſurpers* are ſometimes the Inſtruments of Providence, like *Plagues* and *Famines*, to execute Divine Juſtice upon a ſinful People, who nevertheleſs are ſeldom left without Remedy. The Oppreſſion of the *Iſraelites* in *Egypt*, and of their Poſterity by ſeveral of the neighbouring Nations, and from their own Kings too, were permitted by God for their Sins: But then his Providence rais'd up *Moſes*, and ſeveral of the Judges, to be the *Deliverers* of his *People*. Whatever Mr. *E.* may think, in God's account *one providential King*, who reſcues an *Oppreſs'd Nation* from *Tyranny* and *Deſpotick Violence*, has more of God's Favour for ſo *Glorious and Divine an Enterprize, than a thouſand Hereditary Tyrants*. Doing the leaſt Good has ever God's Approbation, who is the great Legiſlator, and the righteous Judge: The greateſt Good then cannot but be moſt agreeable to his Will, and his Authority in the Government of the World; and therefore moſt certainly conſonant to the Rules of Equity and Juſtice found in the Holy Scriptures, or diſcoverable by the Light of Nature. From which Conſideration it may be moſt truly affirm'd, that the *Glorious Deliverers* of Oppreſs'd Nations act in that Work moſt certainly by a *Divine Right*; whereas *Uſurpers* and *Tyrants*, as ſuch, have not the leaſt claim to a *Divine* or *Human Right*: in which I greatly differ from Mr. *E. pag.* 30. who is ſetting up what juſt before he had pull'd down, and makes a ſettled Uſurpation of the *Cæſars* the Ordinance of God. By this new Inconſiſtency, if *Richard*, or his Son, had fix'd *Oliver*'s Uſurpation, it muſt at laſt have been God's Ordinance! Monſtrous Abſurdity!

§. 62. After Mr. *E.* had given us his Senſe of *Romans* 13. which is not of that moment to be con-

conſider'd, he begins to name his *Corollaries*; 1ſt, *That no Government can be alter'd or ſubverted but by a Divine Command.* He ſeems by Government to mean the Form of Government. By what Divine Command does this Gentleman think, that the ſeveral Independent *Monarchies* in this *Iſland*, which before King *Egbert* were about twelve, in *England*, *Scotland* and *Wales*, were reduced after ſome Ages under one Head? We know this happen'd, partly by Conqueſt and partly by Marriage; but 'tis trifling to purſue this Gentleman's Singularities. He might have ſav'd himſelf the Trouble and Vanity of Citations from the *Fathers* about Obedience to Government. Every reaſonable Man is ſatisfy'd in that, except his Friends, who appear'd at *Preſton* and *Dumblain*; and his Declamations againſt *Rebellion* wou'd not be unſeaſonable, if diſcreetly addreſs'd to the late *Rebels* and their *Abettors*: But as they are manag'd, can do us no Service, nor bring the Author any Credit, who has ſeveral daring Innuendo's and new Notions about our *Conſtitution*, which will ſurprize, but not convince his Readers, nor ſurvive himſelf. Never any Gentleman before him, I dare ſay, had the like Notion of our Conſtitution, and 'tis likely no body that comes after him will have the ſame. Whoever has dipp'd into our Laws and Hiſtories, ſmile at his Performance, as our *Divines* do at the reading his Expoſition of *Romans* 13. The beſt Excuſe for ſuch a Rhapſody, is his Party-Zeal, which itſelf needs an Excuſe. The Gentleman has made a curſory ſearch after Authorities, and ſet down every thing that fell in his way without Examination. When he gives himſelf time to conſider, he has Parts enough to diſcover his own Miſtakes, and I wiſh he may do himſelf the Honour to forſake 'em.

§. 63. Give me leave, my Lord, briefly to repreſent a few more of his Overſights in his Reflection upon the Biſhop of *Bangor*. In *pag.* 76. Mr. *E.* ſays,

, The Bishop challenges any Man to prove, that ever instituted any particular Form of Human ...t for any Nation, but one; yet he, in the ...t ...or two, says, *According to* the *Bishop's* ... *God in the Holy Scriptures never instituted any* ...y *Government.*

64. In *pag.* 78. Mr. *E. very fairly* infers, from *Bishop's* saying, *That God had instituted no Form of Government*, &c. *that therefore God had appointed no Government at all:* and then Mr. *E.* falls in- *Jacobite Fits*, &c. which have a great appear- of *Lunacy and Idiocy* while they last; for they ke him forgetful of the Bishop's Character and his n, and hurry him into indecent Insinuations: *which ...ss, and will only* tell him, that it wou'd be well ... *E's* Friends, if they had minded better their ... *Declarations* and *Subscriptions* too; or cou'd ... ...y to reconcile with them their *Denial of the* ... ..., their *new Notions of Priestly Powers*, ... *Notions of unlimited Obedience* to *Princes*, ... *L... and against Law, and against the real Au-* ... *of those Princes founded in Law:* Their *Gross* ... *scriptural Notions of the Trinity, and Divi-* ... *of Blessed Saviour:* Their continual *Cant* of ... *ch*, the *Church*; especially when they have ...rted any *new*, *false* or *ridiculous Doctrines*, or have ... any Plot against the Government.

65. Mr. *E.* is much offended with the *Bishop* mentioning King *James* II's. Incapacity for our *...test. Government*; and he says, that he is sorry ... in the *Bishop's* Book, *pag.* 25. *That King* James ... *Lunatick or an Idiot*, &c. This is citing ... Bishop's Words as a *Jesuit* wou'd do. Does not ... *E.* know, that no such Words are to be found that Page, or in any part of the *Bishop's* Book? ..., does not the Bishop say in that very Page ex- ...ly, that "*King* James's *Natural Temper, and his Moral Accomplishments were no worse than those of many other Princes, and that it was his Religion*

"*only*

"*only that made him incapable?*" How durſt Mr. *E.* then in defiance to his own Eyes and his own Conſcience ſay, that he is ſorry *to find* in the *Biſhop's* Book, *pag.* 25. *That King* James *commenc'd a Lunatick, or an Idiot*, &c. when he found no ſuch Words, but quite contrary Expreſſions? Yet Mr. *E.* falſly puts thoſe Words upon the *Biſhop*, and then aſſaults him, without Mercy or Civility, in the 84th *Page*, where Mr. *E.* takes upon him to draw Conſequences from the *Biſhop's* Words, to render him odious and ridiculous: Which puts me in mind of the like *barbarous Practice* of the *Popiſh Writers* in *James* II's Reign, when they durſt not, and cou'd not undertake to anſwer like Scholars and Gentlemen the Diſcourſes of our *Divines*; they preſently betook themſelves to this *Stratagem*, of amuſing the People, by telling 'em the abſurd or wicked Conſequences of this and that eminent Clergyman's Doctrines. Juſt thus the Biſhop is us'd by the candid Mr. *E.* in ſeveral Inſtances, which Mr. *E.* muſt bluſh to review, if he thinks any Juſtice due to an Adverſary.

§. 66. Mr. *E.* *pag.* 86. charges the *Biſhop* with *a manifeſt Falſhood*; and ſays, "*He was aſtoniſh'd to find* "*that the word Spirituality is by the Biſhop ſaid to be* "*in the Form of Homage done by Biſhops to the King.*" How bold a Charge is this? How wou'd this Gentleman be offended, if a Charge of Ignorance and Inſolence were retorted? Either Mr. *E.* has not ſeen the Form, or he has, as he wou'd inſinuate. If he has not, how durſt he charge the Biſhop with Falſhood right or wrong? If he has ſeen the Form, how aſtoniſhing muſt his Confidence be, to ſay, *the Temporalities* are expreſly mention'd without the *Spiritualities?* Poor Gentleman! He was frighted with the Sound of the Word: when 'tis well known that *Spiritualities*, in the Form of Homage, don't ſignify the *Powers* that are purely Eccleſiaſtical, receiv'd in Conſecration; but means only the *Profits*

he

he receives as a *Biſhop*, and not as a Baron of Parliament. Stawnford's *Pleas of the Crown*, p. 132.

§. 67. Mr. *E.* is intoxicated with a new Notion of the *Nonjurors*; that *the Relation between a Biſhop and his Dioceſe, being of a Spiritual Nature, is not to be diſſolv'd by the Civil Magiſtrate.* According to which Doctrine, the Popiſh *Biſhops* who were diſabled by an Act 1 *Eliz.* (and ſome hundreds of Divines who were depriv'd by the Act of Uniformity 1662) continu'd notwithſtanding the Rightful Paſtors, and were not regularly depriv'd; and the Proteſtant Biſhops who ſucceeded were Intruders! Whither are theſe Men driving? *

§. 68. This Gentleman wilfully runs into the ſame Miſ-repreſentation of the Biſhop, as the reſt, who have written againſt the Biſhop. In *p.* 40. and afterwards for ſeveral Pages together, the Biſhop plainly ſays, "*The Lay-Power does not concern itſelf with the* "*Powers or Capacities within*; *but only* takes care "they ſhall not *be exerted to the hazard of the* "*Publick*, and deprives *Eccleſiaſticks of the Exerciſe* "*of their Office or Function, to the Prejudice of the* "*State*, &c." This is the conſtant Stile of the Biſhop every where; yet, to make the Biſhop odious, this Gentleman repreſents him as maintaining, that *Biſhops may be depriv'd by Lay-Powers of their Spiritual, and Epiſcopal Powers, and Eccleſiaſtical Character*; which every *Reader* may preſently ſee is a

* *My Lord* Coke *expreſly tells us*, Inſtit. 1 Part. §. 648. *That at firſt all the Biſhopricks of* England *were founded by our Kings, and were* Donative, *till the 9th of King* John. *And the* Founders *and Patrons of Churches or Chappels* admitted *Clerks, without the Intervention of the* Ordinary, *to give* Admiſſion *and* Inſtitution. *This was the firſt beginning of that pretended indiſſoluble Relation by Civil Power. It muſt be remembred alſo, that ſuch* Founders *had a right to* viſit, *and not the Ordinary, and conſequently had a right to* deprive, *if they found their terms of Admiſſion violated.* Hugh's *Parſon's Law*, Cap. I.

notorious Imposition upon himself and the Bishop too.

§. 69. The Case of *Abiathar* is so fully, clearly, and unanswerably stated by the Bishop, as far as an Instance of Deprivation in the Jewish Government can extend to a parallel case in the *British* Government, that the Bishop's Answerers are put to hard shifts to elude the force of it, and to impose upon their Readers. The Text says expressly, that King *Solomon*, 1 *Kings* 2. 25, 26, and 35. *thrust out Abiathar from being Priest unto the Lord*—and *Zadok the Priest did the King put in the room of Abiathar. Grotius* in *Loc. says* Solomon *did this* Jure Regio. *Vatablus*, says, *Privavit eum Sacerdotali Dignitate.* But *Estius*, *Corn. a Lapide*, *and the Popish Commentators*, will have *Abiathar*'s Deprivation to be only *indirectè*, *& ex consequenti*; that is, the Consequence of his Banishment from *Jerusalem*, where only the High Priest's Office cou'd be executed: and this last is the Sense of the *Nonjurors*. We won't quarrel about Niceties, Mr. *E*'s Sense shall be admitted, *viz.* that King *Solomon* only banish'd *Abiathar*. It must follow then, that he hinder'd, and totally disabled him from executing the *High Priest's Office*, which is all the Bishop contends for; and by putting *Zadok* in *Abiathar*'s room, it will also follow, that there was a Vacancy, and *the Spiritual Relation* between *Abiathar* and the *Jewish Church* was extinguish'd by *mere Exile*; for the Nonjurors will not allow it was done by Royal Authority. If therefore King *George* wou'd oblige hereafter our *Nonjurors*, he must not take upon him to *deprive 'em* by Acts of Parliament, but only *banish 'em* out of the *Nation*, which is a proper *Civil Punishment* they admit the *Lay Power* may exercise. And this was exercis'd by *Arcadius* the Emperor, who banish'd St. *Chrysostom* for the Liberty he took of reflecting upon the Empress *Eudoxia* in his Sermons. What does Mr. *E.* think had been his Punishment, if

if *Chryſoſtom* had declar'd againſt *Arcadius* for another Emperor?

Mr. *E*'s Readers muſt ſmile at his pretended Triumph over the Biſhop, *pag.* 91. becauſe the *Biſhop* allows a *Heathen Emperor the Right of Self-Defence againſt a Biſhop who is his Enemy; and yet maintains the Incapacity of a Popiſh Prince to govern this Proteſtant Realm.* From hence Mr. *E.* inſults with this Concluſion, *That Popery*, upon the *Biſhop's* Principles, *is a greater Incapacity than Paganiſm:* Which, however ſtrange this may appear to Mr. *E.* and his Friends, who have lately a great Tenderneſs for *Popery*; yet 'tis found by ſad Experience to be too true in *Hungary*, *Tranſylvania*, and other Countries, where *Popiſh* and *Mahometan* Princes have by turns been their Maſters by the Fate of War. The *Proteſtants* who have made the Trial, and other Chriſtians, prefer the *Mahometan* to the *Popiſh* Yoke, as lighter of the two. And if our *Jacobites* were to make a trial, they wou'd find it ſo, unleſs they have lately made ſome further ſecret Steps towards a Coalition with the *Church of* Rome.

§. 70. One wou'd think by the Air and Stile of ſeveral Paſſages in his Book, Mr. *E.* had been actually *reconcil'd*. There's ſo much Fierceneſs and Ill-breeding in moſt of the Paragraphs towards the end of the Pamphlet, that it may be well ſuſpected to have been publiſh'd, *Permiſſu Superiorum.* He ſeems to have learn'd *Leſley*'s Art of playing the *Trickſter* and *Buffoon* in Controverſy, and to write for the Mob. Abſurd Inferences are drawn from the *Biſhop's* Words, and falſe Comments put upon 'em; and then the Biſhop is inſulted without Mercy or Good Manners: as every Reader may ſee, eſpecially from the 88th Page to the end of the Book. If young *Oliver* at *Urbino* has no better *Advocates*, than thoſe who have appear'd for him againſt the Biſhop of *Bangor*, his Cauſe, God be prais'd, is grown *deſperate*, and its *Defenders contemptible*. Now Mr. *Leſley* is turn'd

Knight Errant, his *Deputy Controvertiſts* expoſe themſelves, and their Cauſe, by the weakeſt and rudeſt Pamphlets that have been penn'd, ſince the Days of King *James* II. when the Prieſts and Jeſuits, who cou'd hardly write true *Engliſh*, pretended to banter our Learned Divines, juſt as theſe *Anſwerers do the Biſhop of* Bangor. When Father *Leſley* comes to hear how theſe *Triflers* have manag'd in his Abſence, he'll ſilence the whole Set, and iſſue out new Commiſſions to Father *Milburn*, Father *Welton*, *&c.*

§. 71. The laſt Hand, that is lifted up againſt the Biſhop of *Bangor*, is Mr. *H——gs*, who calls his Papers, *A modeſt Enquiry into the Biſhop of* Bangor's *Preſervative*, &c. and yet very immodeſtly tells the World in the Title Page, that he has prov'd *ſome Principles advanc'd by the Biſhop of* Bangor *ſeem deſtructive of all Reveal'd Religion.* This is a *high Charge* againſt a *Chriſtian Biſhop*, and ought to be grounded upon Proofs very clear and ſtrong, eſpecially when offer'd by a private Member of our Church, againſt a Prelate of his own Communion. I hint this to Mr. *H---gs*, becauſe he ſeems to be a Perſon, whom Religion has made Serious and Inquiſitive. He muſt know, that 'tis not for his own Reputation to make ſo bold an Attack upon a *Biſhop*, even tho his Proofs were probable. What then will the World judge of Mr. *H---gs*, when upon reading they ſhall find *Parturiunt Montes, naſcetur Ridiculus Mus*; That Mr. *H--ggs* was only frighted, and thought there was a dangerous Tendency in a Paſſage or two of the Biſhop's *Preſervative*, and therefore reſolv'd not to ſpare 'em?

§. 72. This Gentleman propoſes, *p.* 3. to conſider two Points in the *Preſervative*, that *of our Saviour's forgiving Sins, and the Caſe of* Abiathar. The Senſe in which our *Saviour* forgave Sins is repreſented by the Biſhop in one entire Paragraph, *p.* 94. and in my poor Opinion, with the utmoſt exactneſs, with rela-

relation to *God*, to our *Saviour*, and *the Nature of Forgiveneſs it ſelf*. The Reader is deſir'd carefully to weigh the *Biſhop's* Words, and then conſider *Mr. H---g's* Remarks, which are not a little foreign and ſurprizing. He does not point out one ſingle Sentence of the *Biſhop's*, wherein he places any Miſtake; but ſets himſelf a task to prove, *that Chriſt forgave Sins by his own original and underiv'd Power*. Now, tho this does not any ways concern the *Preſervative*, yet this Gentleman is very fond of proving it. The firſt Proof is this, "*Chriſt purchas'd* "*us by his Blood, and therefore he had an Original* "*Power to forgive Sins*. Which is in other words, *Chriſt acquir'd* this Power, and therefore 'tis *Original*. What he purchas'd, he had not before; and if he cou'd not forgive Sins before that Purchaſe, he certainly cou'd not forgive 'em originally. So this Argument is φάρμακον Αὐτοφόνον——

§. 73. His next Argument is, "*Chriſt is Self-* "*Exiſtent, and therefore had an original and unde-* "*riv'd Power to forgive Sins*. To prove his Antecedent, he refers us to *the Articles*, but names no Words, nor Clauſe in 'em. All the *Antient Creeds* we have adopted into our *Liturgy* ſpeak of *Chriſt*, as *a begotten Son*; now is *that a Self-Exiſtent Son? The Son is ſaid to be of* (ἀπὸ, that is, *from*) *the Father*; and is that Self-Exiſtent? *The Father is of, or from none*, is not that Self-Exiſtent? So the *Creed*, commonly call'd *Athanaſian*; and ſo the *four Evangeliſts*, and the *whole New Teſtament*, and all *Orthodox* and *Heterodox Antiquity too*.

§. 74. Mr. *H---g's* next Step is to produce ſeveral Texts in favour of *Chriſt's* Purchaſe and Self-Exiſtence; which, ſome of 'em at leaſt, were never preſs'd into the Service before. The Reader will bluſh for him; and think, as I do, it was great pity this Gentleman ſhou'd not know himſelf, or be better adviſ'd. Alas for him, the World will not bear his proving *Quidlibet ex quolibet*. His 5th, 6th and

and 7th *Pages* are written in the way of *Jacob Behmen*, or Mr. *Sikes*, and are really *paſt all Human Underſtanding*. What Mortal wou'd expect, that is acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, an Application ſo foreign, ſo inept, from a Man of Letters!

§. 75. The next thing this Gentleman undertakes is the Caſe of *Abiathar*; upon which he endeavours to ſhew,

1. That *Abiathar* was not High Prieſt.
2. That he was not depos'd by *Solomon*.
3. That the Kings of *Judah* had no Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy.

For the firſt Point, *That* Abiathar *was not High Prieſt*; 'tis a Notion contrary to the Judgment of the beſt *Commentators*, who from 2 *Sam.* 8. 15. and Ch. 15. 29---35. and Ch. 19. 11. and from other places ſay, the High Prieſthood was jointly in *Zadok* and *Abiathar* for ſome time; and perhaps exercis'd alternately, as the Functions of the Prieſts were by the Poſterity of *Eleazar* and *Ithamar*, 1 *Chron.* 24. from whom *Zadok* and *Abiathar* deſcended. 2. 'Tis evident, that *Abiathar* executed the Function of High Prieſt alone for ſome time, otherwiſe *Zadok* cou'd not be ſaid to be put in his room, 1 *Kings* 2. 35. for *Zadok* was without diſpute *High Prieſt*; and what cou'd he be appointed to execute in the room of *Abiathar*, but the High Prieſt's Office? 3. Upon a compare of two Texts which Mr. *H---gs* deſires to have read and compar'd, *viz.* 2 *Sam.* 20. 25. and 1 *Kings* 4. 4. I ſay, 'tis plain from theſe Texts, that the principal *Military*, *Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtical Officers* in *David*'s and *Solomon*'s Courts are there recited, and in both Texts *Abiathar* is nam'd with *Zadok*. 4. *Menochius* has demonſtrated from *Joſephus*, as well as from other Conſiderations, that *Abiathar* was *High Prieſt*. And *Grotius* ſays expreſly, that the *High Prieſts*, pointing at the Caſe of *Zadok* and *Abiathar*, were appointed or depos'd by the *Kings of* Iſrael. 5. Suppoſing, but not granting, that *Abiathar*

har was not High Prieſt; yet, as *Vatablus* words it, *Solomon privavit eum dignitate Sacerdotali*; or, *Dejecit ab executione Officii*, as moſt agree: and that is enough for an Inſtance of the Deprivation of a Prieſt by the Civil Power, which is the point the Biſhop of *Bangor* had in his view. But to return, Mr. *H---gs* indeed roundly affirms, *p.* 11. that *Abiathar* cou'd not be *High Prieſt* till the Extinction of *Eleazar*'s Line. This, if true, muſt be becauſe the High Prieſthood was by God's appointment confin'd to Seniority and Proximity of Blood; but I don't find any ſuch Order in the *Levitical Law* *. Beſides 'tis look'd upon as certain, by Learned Men, that from *Uzzi* to *Zadok*, the four intermediate Perſons in fact were *not High Prieſts*. *Eli* was not of the Line of *Eleazar*, and is not found in his Genealogy, 1 *Chron.* 6. But *Joſephus*, *Lib. Antiq.* 5. makes *Eli* a Deſcendant of *Ithamar*, *Aaron*'s younger Son; and ſo it appears that he was, by comparing 1 *Sam.* 4. 11. chap. 14. 3. chap. 22. 20. with 1 *Chron.* 24. 3. in which laſt Text *Ahimelech* is ſaid to be of the Sons of *Ithamar*. And the ſame *Ahimelech* by the foregoing Texts appears to be the Great Grandſon of *Eli*.

§. 76. The next thing Mr. *H---gs* undertakes, is to ſhew, that "*Abiathar never was depos'd by Solo-*"*mon*, *p.* 12, 13." The reſt of the Gentlemen who have pretended to anſwer the *Biſhop*, have not, in this particular, ſo openly attack'd that plain Account of a matter of fact, 1 *Kings* 2. 27. as this Gentleman does. They choſe the way of the *Popiſh Commentators*, to evade the force of the Text, by ſaying, that *Solomon* depriv'd, or depos'd, or excluded *Abiathar*, *indirectè*, *& ex conſequenti*, &c. and not *de jure & Autoritate propriâ*, &c. but this Gentleman cites

* *The Separation of* Aaron *and his Sons, all without Diſtinction, is appointed*, Exod. 28. *and* 29*th Chap. and the Perpetuity of the Prieſthood was promis'd to* Aaron's *Sons in general*, ibid.

theſe

theſe Words, [*Solomon thruſt out Abiathar from being Prieſt unto the Lord*, *] and preſently takes upon him to ſhew, that he was not *thruſt out* by *Solomon*. This is a little ſhocking, to deny in expreſs terms what the *Scriptures* affirm in a matter of fact. What are Mr. *H---gs* Reaſons? Why, he cites a Prophecy concerning *Eli*'s Poſterity, mention'd 1 *Sam.* 2. 31.——*ad fin.* "*Which ſhews, that his Po-*"*ſterity* (*of which* Abiathar *was one*) *ſhou'd be excluded* "*from the Prieſthood, and ſhou'd intreat to be put in* "*the Prieſt's Office*, &c." Now this, *Interpreters* refer to *Abiathar*, who was excluded. But Mr. *H--gs*, with wonderful Sagacity, brings this Prophecy, which foretold Abiathar *ſhould be excluded*, to prove that he *was not excluded*. And if he was not, it does not appear that any other of *Eli*'s Poſterity were excluded; but the Reader will obſerve, that the whole Paſſage, 1 *Sam.* 2. 31. *ad fin.* is a Denunciation againſt *Eli*'s Family and Poſterity, part of which was fulfill'd by *Hophni* and *Phineas*, and *Ahimelech*'s being ſlain; but the compleat fulfilling of that Prophecy, by the Excluſion of *Abiathar* from being Prieſt, is directly apply'd in that very particular, 1 *Kings* 2. 27. to the foremention'd Prophecy. So then here's a very plain caſe directly contradicting Mr. *H---gs*'s Notion, that *Abiathar was not excluded from the Prieſthood*. *Eli* was told of the Fate of his Family, becauſe of theirs, and his Sins; that ſome ſhou'd be cut off, *&c.* and others excluded, *&c.* and when *Abiathar*'s Excluſion was mention'd, 'tis preſently ſaid to be a fulfilling of that Prophecy.

§. 77. My Lord, my Readers will wonder how Mr. *H---gs* evades ſo plain a Paſſage, for he does but evade it. Why firſt, he ſays, *p.* 13. we find *Abia-*

* *The Learned Biſhop* Jewel *thus expreſſes his Senſe of the matter*; Abiatharus Epiſcopum ſummovit, & in ejus locum Zadocum ſurrogavit. Apol. p. 162. 12mo Edit.

thar

thar, 1 *Chron.* 4. 1 —4. as he was in *David*'s time, " *next to* Zadok, *over all the Courſes of Prieſts*, &c." But does that Text ſay ſo much? Nothing like it. The Names of *Zadok* and *Abiathar* are mention'd indeed (as they are 2 *Sam.* 20. 25.) but ſo are the Names of the other principal Officers, that acted under *Solomon* during his Reign. *Abiathar* having been High Prieſt, or executing the High Prieſt's Office at the beginning of *Solomon*'s Reign, his Name might well be inſerted in the Liſt, which the Author of *Chronicles* makes of *Solomon*'s chief Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Officers. *Abiathar, ſolo nomine Sacerdos, ut vacantes in Imperio*, &c. as *Grotius*. I believe Mr. *H---gs* is the firſt, and 'tis likely, will be the laſt who will ſuppoſe *Abiathar* was ſtill executing the Prieſts Office in contradiction to a plain Text, 1 *Kings* 2. 27. which ſays, *he was thruſt out from being Prieſt*; and Mr. *H---gs* ventures to ſuppoſe this, only becauſe *Abiathar* happens to be mention'd in a Liſt of the Chiefs who had acted under *Solomon* during his Reign.

§. 78. Mr. *H---gs*'s next reaſon why *Abiathar* was not depos'd by *Solomon*, was *perhaps never* mentioned, nor never thought on by any body but himſelf. All the *Learned Verſions*, and *Commentators*, are againſt him in his new Notion. He ſays, *p.* 14. *that* וינרש ſhou'd be render'd, " *Solomon wou'd have* " *thruſt him out*, &c." *Immanuel Tremellius*, the Learned *Junius*, *Caſtalio*, *the Vulgar*, the Seventy, and, I believe, all the Antient Verſions, and thoſe in Modern Languages that I have ſeen, agree with our Tranſlation exactly, and are full againſt Mr. *H---gs*'s Verſion. The Verſion of the Seventy is of very great Authority with all Learned Men, and that is as expreſs as any of the reſt: and what confirms our Tranſlation, and the Senſe wherein every body has underſtood this Text till now, is this; that in the 35th *ver.* of the ſame 1 *Kings* 2.

'tis plainly said, that *Solomon* put *Zadok* in the room of *Abiathar*; which cou'd not have been done, if *Solomon* only *wou'd* have thrust out *Abiathar*, as Mr. *H---gs* wou'd have it; and *Abiathar* had not been actually thrust out, depos'd, or depriv'd. Besides, 'tis observable, that immediately before, in the beginning of the said 35th *ver.* 'tis said, that *Solomon* put *Benaiah* in the room of *Joab* over the Host; and then 'tis added, that he put *Zadok* in the room of *Abiathar*. Whence 'tis evident beyond all Contradiction, that *Zadok* succeeded in the room and stead of *Abiathar*, as *Benaiah* did in the room and stead of *Joab*: A new *General*, and High Priest, in place of the old ones. And as for Mr. *H---gs* his Criticism upon the *Hebrew* Verb, which is a future in *Pihel* of the Preter Signification, I don't find any ground for it in the *Grammar* of that Language, or any peculiar *Idiom* in that word to justify his Supposition, but the contrary. How vain and ostentatious this Attempt to alter the Version appears in Mr. *H---gs*, I leave others to judge.

§. 79. And now, my Lord, we are come to Mr. *H---gs*'s third Assertion; and that is, that the Kings of *Judah had no Supremacy of their Priests*, p. 15. What then? Suppose that to be so. Had not the Kings of *Israel?* Yes, Mr. *H---gs* says, "*They* "*had an absolute Supremacy.*" Very well, that's as much granted as can be desir'd. For *Solomon* was King of the twelve Tribes: So according to Mr. *H---gs*, he then had an *Absolute Supremacy*, and might therefore, if he pleas'd, deprive *Abiathar*, or any of the *Priests*, not only upon a Civil, but also upon an Ecclesiastical Account, if Mr. *H---gs* be right in saying he had an Absolute Supremacy; but that, at present, is not worth Enquiry. Tho I cannot but observe without pity, that Mr. *H---gs* very *accurately* informs his Readers what was the Foundation of this *Absolute Supremacy*,

macy, in theſe words—*It was founded upon this*, ſays he, that the Kings of *Iſrael* made the *Prieſthood and Religion over which they were ſo Supreme.* I leave this to be underſtood by others, for my part I can only admire, and wonder the Gentleman had no Friends to keep him from expoſing——but I forbear, tho I muſt tell him, the very next Paragraph one wou'd think was written in *Be——m.* No wonder then, that he goes on to give himſelf ſuch Airs, and to conclude with abundance of Satisfaction in himſelf.

§. 80. He goes on, *p.* 19. to except againſt the *Biſhop* for ſaying, Solomon *claim'd a Right over the Life of* Abiathar. I don't find it worded ſo by the *Biſhop.* However, no body can well doubt but ſo much is imply'd in *Solomon*'s words, "*Thou art wor-*" *thy of Death, but I will not at preſent put thee to* "*death.*" Becauſe of the Duty and Affection he had ſhown to his Father *David*, that alone mov'd his Compaſſion, and ſuſpended the Execution of *Abiathar*, and the depriving him of his Income at *Anathoth*; which being a Freehold for Life only, and a Perſonal Intereſt, muſt have follow'd the Fate of its Poſſeſſor; it being in the King's power to have held, or receiv'd *Abiathar*'s Income during his Life, which was the longeſt Term a Prieſt cou'd be Maſter of. As for the Allotment of forty eight Cities and their Territories out of the twelve Tribes, for the Maintenance of the Prieſts by Divine Appointment, there was nothing ſingular in that, foraſmuch as the whole Country was by the ſame Divine Appointment allotted to the twelve Tribes, *Joſh.* 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. So that if ſuch Appointment render'd the Title of the preſent Poſſeſſor indefeizable, then there cou'd be no Forfeiture of any other Man's Title that was not of the Sons of *Aaron.*

§. 81. My Lord, Mr. *H---gs* had a mind to make his Paper remarkable, by pretending to ſhew, that *ſome Principles advanced by the Biſhop of* Bangor *are deſtructive of all Reveal'd Religion.* This bold Suggeſtion he takes care to make the very firſt Article in his Title-Page. How this becomes the Title of his Paper, which is call'd, *A Modeſt Enquiry*, I leave others to judge; and deſire he wou'd well conſider, eſpecially at this *Seaſon of Humiliation.* Surely a modeſt Man wou'd have been far from treating thus a *Biſhop* of his own Communion, unleſs the grounds he went upon were clear and undeniable. In this modeſt manner our Biſhops and Divines were attack'd in *James* II's Reign by *the modeſt Prieſts and Jeſuits*, who writ to the *Mob*; luſtily affirming, and ſtoutly denying whatever was for their purpoſe. They thought to carry all by Bluſter and Noiſe. Had Mr. *E---ry*, or Mr. *H---gs*, or any of the Biſhop's Anſwerers, been the Diſciples of *Loyola*, they cou'd not have treated a *Proteſtant Biſhop* in harder Terms, or with more groundleſs Clamour and ſtupid Reflections. If a Man had not a great mind to cavil, wou'd ſuch a Paſſage as Mr. *H---gs* refers to in the 78th *Page* of the *Biſhop's Preſervative*, be made the ground of ſo terrible an Accuſation, as that *the Biſhop's Principles ſeem deſtructive of all Reveal'd Religion?* To give colour to this Charge, Mr. *H---gs* is oblig'd to be very obſcure, and unſearchable in his Arguments. Had I a mind to divert my Readers, I might come upon him directly, and prove that Mr. *H---gs*'s Notions *overthrow the whole Deſign of the New Teſtament, and the expreſs Doctrine of all the Antient Creeds*; who all affirm, in every place, that Jeſus Chriſt *was the Son of God, ſent of God, receiv'd Power from God, was God of God, begotten of God*, &c. whereas Mr. *H---gs*, in contradiction to all theſe, affirms, *Chriſt is a Self-exiſtent Being.*

Again,

Again, how eaſy is it to charge Mr. *H---gs* with ſapping the Foundation of the Chriſtian Religion, by his deriving, *p.* 25, 26. the great Evidence of the Chriſtian Religion from *a Regular uninterrupted Succeſſion of Perſons qualify'd and regularly Ordain'd?* &c. For this is his Chain of Evidences—"*The* "*Evidence of the Chriſtian Religion were miraculous* "*Facts*—*the Sacraments are the Memorials of thoſe* "*Facts, and a Regular uninterrupted Succeſſion only,* "&c. *can preſerve thoſe Memorials, and aſſure us that* "*they are for ſuch a purpoſe*, &c." The *Papiſts* build the *Authority of the Canon* upon the *Authority of the Church*, by which they mean *Eccleſiaſticks*. Mr. *H---gs* builds the Authority of the Chriſtian Religion upon the ſame Foundation, in other Words.

§. 82. In his fifth Section, where the Biſhop is treated with ſo little Reverence, and the Evidence of the Chriſtian Religion plac'd by Mr. *H---gs* upon ſo ſandy a Foundation; he points ſome artleſs Reflections againſt ſome of the greateſt Divines of our Church, who making the Scriptures their Rule, and genuine Antiquity their Guide, have with honeſt Courage imitated their Forefathers who liv'd before, at, and ſince the Reformation. If Perſons were to be blam'd for altering their Judgments, to what purpoſe are all Scripture-Inſtructions and Exhortations? *Not to ſee groſs Miſtakes, is to be Stupid; not to own what we ſee, is to be Hypocrites*; and to condemn the *Apoſtles*, and many of the *Primitive Fathers*, whoſe Glory it was that they alter'd their Judgments, and openly profeſs'd it, tho it coſt 'em their Lives. I wiſh this Gentleman wou'd ſo well conſider Perſons and Things, as to mend his Miſtakes, and acknowledge 'em too. Wou'd any body that has a true regard for his own Character, be guilty of ſuch Trifling as he plays upon his Readers

ders in his last Section? He thinks fit to put the Bishop in mind of some Passages in our *Articles*, *Canons*, and History relating to Ordination, *&c.* as if the Bishop had either forgot, or rejected 'em. Undoubtedly Mr. *H---gs* is as proper a Monitor, as *Harding* was to Bishop *Jewel*. 'Tis well for that Bishop that Mr. *H---gs* was not his Cotemporary, he wou'd have reprimanded him severely for several Passages in his admirable Apology; as particularly for these Words, *p.* 182. *Animo pio ac Deum timenti promissa est Dei Gratia, non Cathedris & Successionibus.* Mr. *H---gs* wou'd have loaded him with Tragical Accusations of slighting and despising the Episcopal Powers and Sacred Character, of rejecting the great Evidence of the Christian Religion, and of holding Principles that seem destructive of all Reveal'd Religion. I think Mr. *H---gs* is one of the first who has made a *Regular Uninterrupted Succession* one of the prime Evidences of the Christian Religion. The Papists, indeed, have made it one of the Marks of the true Church; but whoever looks into the Writings of our most eminent Reform'd Divines, will find, that they have by no means laid any stress upon such a *Regular* Uninterrupted *Succession* of Persons in Holy Offices; but upon a *Succession in the true Faith, and sound Doctrine*, which was the very Sense of the Primitive Fathers. *Tertul. in Lib. de Præscription.* says, *Non ex personis fidem, sed ex fide personas probari oportet.* And St. *Ambrose, de Pœnitentia, l.* 1. *c.* 6. says, *Non habent Hæreditatem Petri, qui fidem Petri non habent.* Mr. *H—gs* may see, that the Pope's Pretence of a *regular uninterrupted Succession* from St. *Peter*, would have been despis'd by St. *Ambrose*, unless he succeeded to the Faith of St. *Peter*, which we are sure he does not. Yet in this Point of Succession, the Vanity and Pride of our *Romish* Adversaries

ſaries is very remarkable, and very ridiculous: And 'tis not leſs remarkable, that ſome amongſt us ſnatch up Popiſh Cudgels, with which they aſſault their own Proteſtant Biſhops. 'Tis a melancholy, but a true Obſervation, that ſome peeviſh Spirits amongſt us, who are weak in the Faith, but ſtrong in their Paſſions and Reſentments, having taken Offence at the late Revolution, are grown angry with their Leaders, and are making daily Advances towards *Popery*. Several Proofs of this are to be met with in the Writings of Dr. *Hickes*, and Mr. *Leſly*, and others too, whom I am unwilling to name, becauſe I would hope they may grow wiſer.

§. 83. But I muſt return to Mr. *H——gs*, who becauſe he ſo boldly challenges the Biſhop in *his Enquiry*, and his *Addreſs to the Convocation*, upon the point of a *regular uninterrupted Succeſſion*, &c. he's deſir'd to look over any Series of Biſhops, of any of the Sees now extant, and conſider with himſelf, if he can trace any one Succeſſion, from the preſent Biſhop up to the Apoſtles, that has been ſtrictly regular in all the intermediate Biſhops; and if he can produce ſuch certain and undoubted Accounts of ſuch a Succeſſion, as may fully ſatisfy himſelf and all other reaſonable Men, that there has been no Irregularity in the whole Succeſſion. My Lord, Mr. *H—gs* muſt be furniſh'd with ſome extraordinary Accounts beſides what are now publick, if he can make out this regular Succeſſion with that Certainty, as his Opinion of the Neceſſity of ſuch a Succeſſion does neceſſarily require he ſhould. He will find himſelf oblig'd to ſuppoſe and preſume in many Particulars, where he cannot have Certainty, and will be forc'd to ſpeak in as modeſt Terms about this regular Succeſſion, as the Biſhop and other wiſe Men have done; who taking things as they find them,

them, lay no greater ſtreſs upon them than they will bear.

§. 84. My Lord, this Gentleman's Zeal would not let him reſt after a ſingle Attack upon the Biſhop of *Bangor*; but he comes on with another Aſſault upon him, and two other Divines, in a Paper call'd, *The Layman's humble Addreſs to the Convocation*, &c. The Title and Concluſion are in the Stile of one Perſon, but the beginning is Plural. What *Helps* he has had, I know not; but I doubt he has *no Friends* to adviſe him, or is deaf to all Advice. It muſt be ſome Satisfaction to the Biſhop and his Friends to obſerve, that the *Preſervative* has not yet been oppos'd by one judicious Writer. His Lordſhip's only Antagoniſts are the *open Enemies*, or the *ignorant Friends* of our Church and Conſtitution: Of the laſt there would be ſome Hopes, if they would pleaſe to review the *Preſervative* with leſs Paſſion, and more Attention and Modeſty: Rare Qualities, I confeſs, in an *Adverſary*, but not impoſſible to be found in a *good Chriſtian*. Had Mr. *H—gs* acted in this matter with a due regard to himſelf and his Superiours, for whom he often profeſſes a great regard, the Publick had not ſeen his *Addreſs to the Biſhops*. My Lord, there are, as is well known, abundance of Lay-Gentlemen and others of our Communion, as much concern'd in theſe Matters, and as capable of repreſenting their Concern to the *Convocation*, as Mr. *H—gs*. But ſince the Caſe of two of the Reverend Divines, againſt whom Mr. *H—gs* is become an *Appellant*, has been diſmiſs'd by that *venerable Body*; he ſhould have ſhewn them ſo much Duty at leaſt, as to forbear to ſollicite them, and have left them to take their own, which we hope will be a ſeaſonable time, for a further Deliberation upon thoſe weighty and important Points; which are of that high Nature,

Nature, that they deſerve the ſtricteſt and moſt attentive Conſideration. Upon all the ordinary Heads of Controverſy with the Church of *Rome*, *our and the foreign Reformers* had written with ſo much Judgment and Exactneſs at the beginning of the *Reformation*, that they left little room for Additions or Improvement. Moſt of the Texts were examin'd, and the ſeveral Paſſages in the *Fathers* were produc'd to the greateſt advantage: But the Doctrines of the *Trinity*, and the *Divinity of our Bleſſed Saviour*, were receiv'd in *our Church* at the beginning of *our happy Reformation*, as thoſe Doctrines were then generally underſtood and explain'd in all the *Weſtern Churches*. Theſe *great Myſteries* being attended with Difficulties both in the Manner of our Conception of them, and Expreſſions about them, *our Divines* of the higheſt Rank have, upon occaſion, unhappily interfer'd; as Dr. *South*, Dr. *Sherlock*, Dr. *Wallis*, and others, did at the end of the *laſt* Century, and ſome other great Men at the beginning of *this*. By which wiſe Men plainly ſee the great Neceſſity of Charity and Temper in ſuch ſublime Speculations, and do alſo humbly hope a happy time may come, when thoſe great Points may be fully examin'd, and fairly ſtated in our *Supreme Eccleſiaſtical Council*; ſo as to ſilence all Diſputes amongſt our ſelves, and to ſet a Standard to all other *Chriſtian Churches*. This would be a glorious Work, and be attended with bleſſed Conſequences.

§. 85. May *Your Lordſhip*, whom God has honour'd with *the higheſt Dignity in the Chriſtian Church*, and with a *Zeal* for *our Church*, and *Love to your Country*, ſutable to your *ſacred Character*, be one of the happy Inſtruments of advancing the Honour and Peace of our Church; that ſhe may be the *Praiſe*

Glory of (under
ign of reo ajesty
GEOR I

My LORD,

With the greateſt Duty and Veneration,

Your Lordſhip's moſt Obedient, and

Moſt Humble Servant.

F I N I S.

ERRAT.

In the Marginal Note at the bottom of *p.* 24. at the end of the firſt Line, for *deriv'd from their Offices*, r. *depriv'd.*

BOOKS sold by JOHN DARBY *in* Bartholomew-Cloſe.

THE Divine Rights of the *Britiſh* Nation and Conſtitution vindicated: In Remarks on the ſeveral Papers publiſh'd againſt the Reverend Mr. *Hoadley*'s Conſiderations upon the Biſhop of *Exeter*'s Sermons. The Second Edition corrected.

Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*'s Sermon, on Doing as we would be done unto: not printed in any of his Works.

The Charge of God to *Joſhua*: a Thankſgiving-Sermon preach'd before the D. of *Marlborough*, for paſſing the Lines, and taking *Bouchain*. By *Francis Hare*, D. D.

—— *Bouchain*: a Dialogue between the late *Medley* and *Examiner*.

—— The Management of the late War, in 4 Letters to a Tory Member.

—— The Allies and the Late Miniſtry defended, in anſwer to *The Conduct of the Allies*. In 4 parts.

—— Frauds at St. *Paul*'s. In 2 parts.

K. *William*'s Affection to the Church of *England* conſider'd.

Inquiry into the Genuine Authority of 1 *John* 5. 7. *There be three that bear Record in Heaven*, &c.

A new Catechiſm, with Dr. *Hickes*'s thirty nine Articles. With a Preface, relating to the true Intereſt of *Great Britain*, both in Church and State.

Some Thoughts on the Repreſentation of the Lower Houſe of Convocation. In a Letter to Dr. *Atterbury*.

A Letter to a *North-Wiltſhire* Clergyman, relating to an Addreſs from that Archdeaconry to the Queen. With a Character of the Biſhop of *Sarum*, and an Account of the Clergy's Behaviour towards him.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
3 9015 00121 7481